BACONIANA.

VOL. VI. *Third Series.* JULY, 1908. No. 23.

POETRY THE DIVERSION OF BACON'S YOUTH.

HERE at last can be adduced from a contemporary definite testimony to the fact that Sir Francis Bacon was a poet, and, moreover, a poet who sang in the spring-time of his life as the diversion of his youth.

Edmond Waller was born in 1605.* He was the son of Robert Waller, a Buckinghamshire Squire, who was bred a lawyer. Robert Waller practised at the Bar for some years, but retired to live the life of a country gentleman, a course which he afterwards regretted as he considered it too idle. He married a daughter of Hampden of Hampden in Buckinghamshire, one of the most ancient families in England, who was sister to Colonel John Hampden. It is said that he was a man of parts and virtue, that he had a great esteem for the common law, the study of which he preferred to the Civil law. When Edmond was very young his father died, and he came into the estate of Hall Barn, Beaconsfield, with an income of £3,500 per annum. He was educated at Eton, and subsequently

* The facts here stated with reference to Mr. Waller's family and Life are taken from a life of the poet prefixed to the eighth edition of his poems published in 1711.

went to King's College, Cambridge. He was only 17 years of age when he was elected a member of the last Parliament of King James I., and served as Burgess for Agmondesham. This was the Parliament which impeached Bacon. Dr. Birch, who married one of Waller's daughters, gives an account of conversations between the King, Dr. Andrew, Bishop of Winchester, and Dr. Neal, Bishop of Durham, communicated to him by the poet, who was present on the day of the dissolution of the Parliament at the dinner at which they took place. It is said that Waller was well known at Court, and caressed by all the people of quality who had a relish of learning and wit. He was also one of that famous club which included Lord Falkland, Sir Francis Wainmun, Mr. Chillingworth, Mr. Godolphin, and others. Whilst he was at one of their meetings a noise was heard in the street outside, and, upon sending to learn the occasion of it, the members were informed that one of Ben Jonson's sons had been arrested. They sent for him, and he proved to be Mr. Morley, afterwards Bishop of Winchester. Waller liked him so well that he paid the debt (£100) on condition that he would live with him at Beaconsfield, which he did for some eight or ten years. How close a friend Lord Falkland was of Bacon's may be judged by the fact that in writing to Buckingham in December, 1621,* acknowledging the permission given him "to send to your Lordship one to whom you will deliver your mind," he says: "But if your Lordship will have one of my nomination, if I might presume so far, I would name above all others, my lord of Falkland." In the following March it was Falkland who brought permission from Buckingham for him to return to Highgate,† and to whom he wrote shortly afterwards: "It is the best

* Spedding's Life, Vol. VIII, p. 320. † Ibid, p. 342, 343.

accident, one of them amongst men, when they hap to be obliged to those whom naturally and personally they love as I ever did your lordship . . .; so that the sparks of my affection shall ever rest quiet under the ashes of my fortune to do you service."* Lord Falkland is the subject of one of Waller's poems written in 1638.

It is, therefore, beyond question that the testimony of Waller with reference to any circumstance connected with Francis Bacon is of great value. Waller published the first edition of his poems in 1645. This book has a dedication "To my lady" but without a name. The commencement reads thus :—

"Madam,

"Your Commands for the gathering these Sticks into a Faggot had sooner been obey'd, but intending to present you with my whole Vintage, I stay'd, till the latest Grapes were ripe; for here your Ladiship has not only all I have done, but all I ever mean to do of this kind: Not but that I may defend the Attempt I have made up in Poetry, by the Examples (not to trouble you with History) of many Wise and Worthy Persons of our own Times; as Sir Philip Sidney, Sir Francis Bacon, Cardinal Perron, the ablest of his Countrymen; and the former Pope, who they say, instead of the Triple Crown, wore sometimes the poets Ivy, as an Ornament, perhaps, of lesser weight and trouble: But, Madam, these nightingales sang only in the spring, it was the diversion of their Youth; as Ladies learn to sing and play when they are children, what they forget when they are Women: The Resemblance holds further, for as you quit the Lute the sooner, because the posture is suspected to draw the Body awry; so this is not always practised without some Villany of the Mind, wresting it from present

* Spedding's Life, Vol. VIII., p. 344.

Occasions and, accustoming us to Style somewhat remov'd from common Use. But that you may not think his Case deplorable, who had made Verses; we are told, that Tully (the greatest Wit among the Romans) was once sick of the Disease, and yet recover'd so well, that of almost as bad a Poet as your Servant, he became the most perfect Orator in the World. So that so much as to have made Verses, as not to give over in Time, leaves a man without Excuse: The former presenting us with an opportunity at least of doing Wisely, that is, to conceal those we have made, which I shall yet do, if my humble Request may be of as much force with your Ladiship, as your commands have been with me: "

This remarkable statement by Waller that writing poetry was the diversion of Bacon's youth has not been noticed by any of Bacon's biographers. It is significant that in 1645 Waller deemed it necessary to offer an apology for writing poetry, and, by way of justifying his action, cited, amongst others, Sir Francis Bacon as having pursued a similar course.

W. T. Smedley.

DR. FAUSTUS.

By Rev. Walter Begley.

IN the consideration of *The Tragical History of Dr. Faustus*, the first great difficulty that meets us is that a large portion of the play seems to have been written after Marlowe had been dead some years. Part of the play was written when Marlowe was alive—that is clear from internal evidence, and all the critics agree here—but from Henslowe's Diary it appears to have had all the success and large receipts of a new piece just after Marlowe's death; and, indeed, if such a remarkable play had been acted between 1589 and 1593, we should expect some notice of it, but there is none. The comparison of the two editions (1604 and 1616) is very suggestive, both by the omissions and additions. It would take too much of my space to dwell upon it properly here, but in the excellent German (Heilbronn) edition of Marlowe's works the two editions are printed on opposite pages and the differences can be seen at a glance. Some of the omissions in the later edition are just such as might be too applicable to Bacon as the creator and impersonator of Faustus and so rouse suspicion; they are therefore left out for no textual necessities whatever. I will give but one or two instances, though there are many, *e.g.*:—

> "Why, Faustus, hast thou not attained that end?
> Is not thy common talk sound aphorisms?"

Now the second line is altogether left out in the later edition. Why so? It is harmless enough. No; Bacon and aphorisms went too much together to be separated by suspicious or envious critics in 1616, and one might lead up to the other, therefore the line was best out of the play. Moreover, the famous Brazen Head of the earlier Bacon spoke in aphorisms, it was thought. Again, the line—

"Now, Faustus, thou art conjurer laureate"—

is left out, without apparent reason, in 1616. But the words "conjurer laureate" might recall certain circumstances in Bacon's share of the revellings at Gray's Inn, when the proceedings terminated in a *fiasco* and a certain "conjurer" was called in and "arraigned before a jury of twenty-four gentlemen for having helped to increase the late confusions by foisting in some base common fellows as actors." This "conjurer or sorcerer" was Francis Bacon, and the term has always been interpreted with a reference to his namesake, Roger Bacon; but what if the reference was to Dr. Faustus? Not unlikely, surely, especially if we remember the allusive contemporary remarks of Greene and Hall to alchemist and alchemy. But, in any case, it was just as well that Bacon should leave out that phrase, "conjurer laureate," if he really had anything to do with the revision of the play.

It may be asked, Why should anyone take this trouble about *Marlowe's* heresies and atheism; he had been dead years, and no envious tongues could hurt him; his character was also well known? Yes, why, indeed? No one could harm poor Kit Marlowe now. But Bacon was alive and well in evidence before the eyes of the curious and the envious, and if he were connected with the conjurer, Faustus, and his atheistic blasphemy in the mouths of men, it would be a serious matter. I know I am dealing with what the majority of literary critics would call a highly fanciful and unfounded suggestion, but I must say that the more I study *Dr. Faustus* and *Tamburlaine,* and the other plays of Marlowe, the more I intuitively feel that they are not likely to be the work of so young a man—in their present form, at least—nor of *such* a man as far as his character has been handed down to us. The more I

read them the more they seem to be the expression of just such a mighty and aspiring genius as was Francis Bacon, and again and again I seem to see special beauties which can be only equalled by the special charms of similar beauties in the Sonnets of Bacon-Shakespeare or in his immortal plays.

Take only two lines out of that beautiful address to Helen when she appears to Faust—

> "O thou art fairer than the evening aire,
> Clad in the beauty of a thousand starres,"

and then take only two lines of the 18th Sonnet—

> "Shall I compare thee to a summer's day?
> Thou art more lovely and more temperate."

These supreme and *uncommon* gems of poetical simile seem to me marked by the impress of one and the same lofty genius. Or take the very first line of the same address—

> "Was this the face that launched a thousand ships?—

and compare what Shakespeare says of Helen in *Troilus and Cressida*—

> "Why, she is a pearl
> Whose price hath launched above a thousand ships."

Now, I hold that such similarities are more likely to be by the same author repeating himself unconsciously than by a plagiarist stealing or imitating another poet's work. And beyond the peculiar charm of some of the poetry, there is an amount of learning, of philosophy, astronomy and cosmography in the several plays that we should not be inclined to expect from Kit Marlowe, whose career at Cambridge does not appear to have been marked by any distinction or honour in the College records.

Then the magic, necromancy and power over the elements which take up so much of the plot of Faustus

suggest Bacon rather than Marlowe. Of Faust the chorus says at the very beginning of the play—

> "Nothing so sweete as majicke is to him
> Which he prefers before his chiefest blisse,
> And this the man that in his study sits."

Now, we have evidence that Bacon had a high opinion of Hermes Trismegistus, the great *occult* philosopher, for he mentions him with the greatest respect in some of the speeches that he prepared for Essex's Device before the Queen. And Marston, who knew so much about Bacon under the feigned name of Labeo, hints that Labeo had turned his attention to alchemy, and there is other strong evidence which I have given in full in discussing that rare book, *A Woman's Worth.* I am well aware that the Folio editors of 1623 have in some instances altered passages in which occur the name of God, and in others omitted them altogether.* Such alterations after 1606 may be accounted for sometimes, I suppose, by the Stat. 3, James I., c. 21, which was *an act to restrain the abuses of players*, especially profanely abusing the holy name of God or of the Trinity. Admitting this explanation, it still does not cover the excision of such harmless lines as the one about aphorisms and others like it.

Mr. Bullen says of the two editions of Faustus of 1604 and 1616: "The alterations are such as we might expect the author to make on revision." With this I agree thoroughly. But Mr. Bullen goes on to say, a page or two later: "My view, then, is that Marlowe revised his work." But seeing that Marlowe was killed in 1593 and these two editions came out in 1604 and 1616, and we have Henslowe's accounts of additions to Faustus paid for after Marlowe's death, I

* *Cf.* Walker's "Examination of the Text of Shakespeare," Vol. I., pp. 213—218.

cannot quite accept the solution that Marlowe was the responsible reviser.

Moreover, these revisions are just such ones as we should expect from Bacon, and considering the circumstances wherein he was placed, they seem much more appropriate to his peculiar position than to anyone else.

Before leaving *Dr. Faustus* I would say a word or two about "Germane Valdes and Cornelius." Who were intended by these dear friends of Faust whom he sent for to confer with him in his troubles and projects? This has been one of the most puzzling questions connected with the text of Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus.*

Cornelius has always been taken by critics to stand for Henry Cornelius Agrippa, the well-known magician. But there was the difficulty that Agrippa almost directly afterwards is referred to by name on the *Faustus* stage as having been some time dead, while Cornelius is one of the actors taking part in the performance. Critics have disposed of this difficulty in such airy fashion as: "Cornelius can be no one but Agrippa, a magician of universal fame at that time." But the difficulty of the mention of the dead Cornelius Agrippa while the living Cornelius Agrippa was taking an active part in the dialogue seems insuperable.

Nor is it certain that we are obliged to look for Valdes and Cornelius among the magicians or conjurers of the age. They were Faust's friends, well known, no doubt, to Wagner, his servant, who went to seek them by his master's orders.

Now, my contention is that *Dr. Faustus* may be the creation of Bacon, and the part representation of his own views and desires, so it was in Bacon's direction that I looked for a better explanation of Valdes and Cornelius than I had yet been given. I was not long in finding a Cornelius more suitable to the passage than Agrippa. This was Cornelius Valerius, who was,

perhaps, the best living exponent and teacher of that Natural Philosophy in which Bacon was so interested. This Cornelius was, no doubt, often taken down from the shelves of Bacon's study, or held in his hand while he sat thinking in his chair. If Bacon turned his thoughts to natural magic, then Cornelius Valerius would be the man whose book he would consult, for in a letter of advice to Sir Fulke Greville on his travels (*c.* 1595), which was supposed to come from Essex, but, as Mr. Spedding thinks, might much more easily have come from Bacon, there is the suggestion that Ramus is the best author for Logic, Lipsius for Politics, and *Valerius for Physics*, or the Philosophy of Nature. This word Valerius has also extremely Baconic associations. Valerius Terminus is an assumed name of Bacon in an early philosophical work, and there is the merry singing Lord Valerius, that recalls Bacon, in Thomas Heywood's *Rape of Lucrece*, where we seem to have an allusion to Bacon's Sonnets and Verses.

But who is meant by Germane Valdes? Here, I think, that the two Spanish Protestant Reformers, the brothers Juan de Valdés and Alfonso de Valdés, are referred to. If we take "germane" to mean "brotherly," as we speak of brothers-german, it would be a very applicable epithet for those twins; and since the friends are addressed as "Valdes, sweet Valdes, and Cornelius," it looks almost as if *three* were addressed. But there are other hints in this direction, for Juan de Valdéz translated the Psalms from the original Hebrew into Spanish and annotated them, being the first to do this in the vernacular; and he also expounded several parts of the New Testament. This would explain the *line*,

"The *Hebrew Psalter* and New Testament,"

which were to be brought to the place of conference where Faust and they were to meet.

Again, Fra Bernardino Ochino, who was the most popular preacher of his day, had taken the themes of his sermons very often from Valdés, and we know that Ochino was immensely admired by Lady Anne Bacon, Francis' mother, so much so indeed that she transcribed some of his writings herself and published them. Young Francis could hardly fail to hear of Valdés very often in his family circle when a boy, and Valdés was strongly against Spanish Papal influence, as was Francis Bacon as well. They would be friends by sympathy if not by personal knowledge.

I may also add, as a good instance of the adjective "german" referring to brothers, the fact that Anthony Bacon speaks of "the straitest link of german consanguinity" between himself and his brother Francis (Spedding's "Life of Bacon," I. 266).

But I only throw out this suggestion, and do not feel very confident about it, for although Faust calls for them as "dearest friends" to confer with him they seem at the same time to be experts in the "words and ceremonies" of the magic art, and able to instruct Faust in the rudiments of it.

But there is another critic's difficulty of which I *am* confident, and that is the line,

"And bear wise Bacon's and Albanus' works."

Albertus is the reading of modern editions, but there need not be much doubt as to what man is coupled with Bacon under the name Albanus. It was Petrus de Albano whose name appears thus written on the title-page of Agrippa's famous *De Occultâ Philosophiâ* as the author of the *Heptameron*, which appears in a kind of appendix at the end, containing several smaller magical works which have been printed together after Agrippa's.

The more usual way of writing the name was Petrus

de Albano, and he was coupled frequently with Bacon (Roger) as being two famous conjurers or magicians. But here it looks as if *Bacon* and *Albanus* were put in juxtaposition for some cryptogrammatic purpose or hint.

Albanus is the reading of all the early Quartos, and Albertus must be sent packing with his huge load of tomes, enough to bury Faust beneath their mass.

In considering *Dr. Faustus* we must not pass over without notice the remarkable addition of "Bruno in chains," which first occurs in the 1616 edition of the Play, when Marlowe had been dead nineteen years. Now, Giordano Bruno was arrested in Venice in 1598, and ultimately disappeared from all knowledge in 1600. He is supposed to have been publicly burnt to death about that time (*c.* 1599), but the evidence of this fact is not strong. However, Marlowe certainly was buried in 1593, and therefore cannot be held responsible for these later additions to *Dr. Faustus* which bring in Bruno. Who, then, was it that brought Bruno into the play in 1616 or a little before. It cannot be answered yet with any certainty. The play was very popular, and Dekker may have revised it for the players just to turn an honest penny, and to improve the receipts of the play-house, for play-goers were always more ready to come if something new, or some old favourite revised, were offered to them. What made me think of Dekker was the Latin pentameter, or motto, with which the play ends:

Terminat hora diem, terminat auctor opus.

The source of this is not known, but it is also found at the end of *The Distracted Emperor*, generally thought to be written by Dekker. But it may also have had Bacon's revision, for all this new matter about Bruno would be very agreeable to King James I. from a theological point of view. And if critics will examine this Bruno

addition, they will see what I am surprised no one seems to have noticed before, that it is not the atheistical or pantheistical Giordano Bruno that we have to do with, but "*Saxon* Bruno," as he is distinctly named by Raymond, King of Hungary, in Act iii. sc. 1. The whole Bruno incident from beginning to end is connected with the Reformation in Germany (or Saxony) and the independence of the Kings and Emperor from the Pope's arbitrary rule. The personages mentioned quite exclude Bruno, who was not born when some of them were playing a prominent part in the political world, and I cannot understand how no one has noticed *Saxon* Bruno before this. There is not much to gain from it, except that, as now explained, it would please the King and the Anglican hierarchy; but the real Bruno would have been offensive to both, and would have gained no sympathy from King James, whether in chains or bound to the stake—for we know how he hated Vorstius and burnt his books when he could not burn the man. Taking all things together I think the Bruno addition was more likely to come from Bacon than from Dekker, but I cannot tell.

There is a Latin hexameter occurring among the fine poetry of Dr. Faustus which is worth a little notice. It has never been attributed to any classic author, and it might be very helpful if anyone could find out how it came to be used in this play, and from whom the line originated. It is this:

Solamen miseris socios habuisse doloris.
—*Dr. Faustus*, l. 482.

i.e., It is a consolation to those in misery to know that they have had fellow-companions in trouble.

The strange thing is that this unknown hexameter is frequently turning up in unexpected places just about this time (1590-1600).

It occurs in Robert Chester's puzzling poem, "Love's Martyr" (1600), p. 125. It also occurs in [the margin of one of Nash's prose works and in] Dekker's *Seven Deadly Sinnes of London.*

It is also most clearly in *Lucrece* at line 1,578, though here, of course, it appears in English garb:

> "It easeth some, though none it ever cured,
> To think their doulour others have endured."

This would be in 1594, but a year before, that is in June, 1593, it appeared in *The Honour of the Garter*, attributed to George Peele (line 247)

> ——"In misery
> It is some comfort to have company."

In trying to trace this line I first looked into Erasmus' Adagia, fully expecting to find it there, but no; then sundry books of Latin quotations, but no; I then look down my *Geflugelte Worte* of G. Buchmann, 17th edition, 1892, and there found it, the earliest reference being "Marlowe's *Faustus* (1580)." This was early indeed, Marlowe being then just sixteen, but as this date had (in 1892) stood during seventeen editions, and may still be standing, in a book much trusted by Germans, possibly the average German has even a higher opinion of Marlowe's precocious genius than we have.*

One inference we are justified in drawing from the presence of these Latin hexameters and other recondite allusions, that could not possibly be understood or enjoyed by the great majority of the audience, is this, that neither *Tamburlaine* nor *Faustus* were presented on the common stage in the literary form we now have them. They were certainly revised for the Press by someone, even as Hamlet was undoubtedly revised and

* For a full discussion of this line and the sentiment expressed, see R. M. Theobald's "Shakepeare Studies in Baconian Light," chapter v., on Companionship in Calamity.

added to later on. Would Marlowe be so likely to do this as Bacon? Would Marlowe put FRA.B. on the first page?

The chief reason for admitting Marlowe is that his name appears on the title-pages of the early Quartos: a reason strong if taken alone, but quite capable of being overruled if all the circumstances of the case are duly estimated. Moreover, Marlowe's name appears on the title-page of the 1616 edition of *Faustus*, when it is historically impossible that the whole play as there printed can be his. In fact, Elizabethan title-pages, and especially Shakespearean ones, and those allied to them, are all subject to a certain amount of suspicion.

THE GRAVE'S TIRING-ROOM.

(*Continued from page* 121.)

IN his introduction to the Sonnets Hudson says, "A book called 'Shakespeare's Sonnets' was entered at the Stationers' by Thomas Thorp on the 20th of May, 1609. In the course of the same year was issued a small quarto volume of forty leaves with the following title-page: "Shakespeare's Sonnets. Never before imprinted. At London: By G. Eld for T.T., and are to be sold by William Aspley."

We here deny that portion of the statement that says that "during the same year" the edition was issued. Nor was it issued prior to Bacon's fall in 1621, though bearing the ante-date. Will our Shakespearean critics point some reference to this printed edition prior to 1621. We are aware of the "sugared Sonnets" statements as to manuscript copies.

Francis Bacon no longer needs this shield, nor should it longer bind the intellect. It has done this for nearly 300 years, and it is now time for it to move.

We here turn to Son. 111, which opens thus:—

"O, for my sake do you with Fortune chide,
The guilty goddess of my harmful deeds,
That did not better for my life provide
Than public means which public manners breeds.
Thence comes it that my name receives a brand,
And almost thence my nature is subdued
To what it works in, like the dyer's hand."

Believers in the Baconian authorship of the Sonnets —for to you we here address ourselves—what say you?

If Francis Bacon be author of this Sonnet, to what circumstances in his life, please, can it allude? Can there be doubt that he here alludes to his already mentioned impeachment?

If so, then must the date of 1609 be a blind, for both cannot be true. In Son. 123 he defies both Time and its Registers, which, he says, do lie.

Did space permit we would here place Bacon's lament for having entered public life into relation with Sonnet 111. Let it, then, be anew investigated. Did the book accompany the entry at the Stationer's? If yes, did it contain the Sonnets in the line here touched? If so, has the entry itself been tampered with? If not, then both entry and book are but ante-dates.

We have an impression, however, that a small edition of the earlier Sonnets may have been printed and never spread, but suppressed, by reason of Bacon's fears, upon reflection, that Sonnets 1—19, which express a desire through Elizabeth for a Protestant heir to the throne of England, would, to use a Baconian expression, look through, and particularly so, on the theory of Mrs. Gallup's book. When really issued, after his fall, the ante-dated edition could be simply placed in the place of the one on file, and all would stand as now appears.

Why go so far? Because the mentioned date cannot be true. Why? Every phase of Bacon's fall appearing in his letters and papers appears also in the Sonnets, and belies it. We hope hereafter to have an opportunity, by aid of Bacon's letters and papers, of pounding to oblivion for ever this false date, and thus permit a true opening of the so-called Shake-speare Sonnets.

To instance, upon being charged, Bacon at once prepared minutes for an interview with the King, wherein he says: "The law of nature teaches me to speak in my own defense. With regard to this charge of bribery, I am as innocent as any born on St. Innocents day. I never had bribe or reward in my eye or thought when pronouncing sentence or order. If, however, it is absolutely necessary, the King's will shall be obeyed. I am ready to make an oblation of myself to the King, in whose hands I am as clay, to be made a vessel of honor or dishonor."

In this connection let the reader be sure to read in full Son. 88—91. Son. 88, to the king, is in these words:—

"When thou shalt be disposed to set me light
And place my merit in the eye of scorn,
Upon thy side against myself I'll fight
And prove thee virtuous, though thou art forsworn.
With mine own weakness being best acquainted,
Upon thy part I can set down a story
Of faults conceal'd, wherein I am attainted,
That thou in losing me shalt win much glory:
And I by this will be a gainer too;
For bending all my loving thoughts on thee,
The injuries that to myself I do,
Doing thee vantage, double-vantage me.
Such is my love, to thee I so belong,
That for thy right myself will bear all wrong."

Touching the interview itself with the King, wherein Bacon agreed to abandon his defence, see Son. 113.

Note the words "to thee I so belong" in the Sonnet just quoted.

Touching Bacon's use of the word *oblation* in the foregoing statement, see Son. 125. In Son. 58 he says that the offence which needs pardon, is the King's own. In Son. 48, see his statement when first made Chancellor.

To show that a king or sovereign is here referred to, see Son. 57, 58, 114. We quote you Son. 57 thus:—

"Being your slave, what should I do but tend
Upon the hours and times of your desire?
I have no precious time at all to spend,
Nor services to do, till you require.
Nor dare I chide the world-without-end hour
Whilst I, my sovereign, watch the clock for you,
Nor think the bitterness of absence sour
When you have bid your servant once adieu;
Nor dare I question with my jealous thought
Where you may be, or your affairs suppose,
But, like a sad slave, stay and think of nought
Save, where you are how happy you make those.
So true a fool is love that in your will,
Though you do anything, he thinks no ill."

We could put a world of Baconian material into relation with this Sonnet did space permit. Upon being released from the Tower, Bacon, in a letter dated June 4th, 1621, wrote thus to the King:—

"It may please your most excellent Majesty. I humbly thank your Majesty for my liberty, without which timely grant, any further grace would have come too late. But your Majesty, that did shed tears in the beginning of my troubles, will I hope, shed the dew of your grace and goodness upon me in the end. Let me live to serve you else life is but the shadow of death to your Majesty's devoted servant."—*Sped. L.l.* vii. 281.

Concerning these tears, turn to Son. 34, which ends thus:—

"Ah! but those tears are pearl which thy love sheds,
And they are rich and ransom all ill deeds."

In Son. 35 he tells him to grieve no more. But the King's tears after Bacon's later experience with him find expression in Son. 119, which opens thus:—

"What potions have I drunk of Siren tears,
Distill'd from limbecks foul as hell within,
Applying fears to hopes and hopes to fears,
Still losing when I saw myself to win!
What wretched errors hath my heart committed,
Whilst it hath thought itself so blessed never!"
—See Son. 49, 87, 120, 121, 140, 147.

Touching the fears here indicated, see Son. 107, as it applies to his dear love—his philosophy.

Touching the desire for death expressed in Son. 66 and 147, we quote from Bacon's letter to Buckingham upon reaching the Tower, thus: "Good, my Lord: procure the warrant for my discharge this day. Death, I thank God, is so far from being unwelcome to me as I have called for it (as Christian resolution would permit) any time these two months."

We have been trying to prepare the mind of the reader for a just conception of Son. 68, which is the ultimate purpose of our paper, and which is in these words:—

"Thus is his cheek the map of days outworn,
When beauty lived and died as flowers do now,
Before these bastard signs of fair were born,
Or durst inhabit on a living brow,
Before the olden tresses of the dead,
The right of sepulchres were shorn away,
To live a second life on second head;
Ere beauty's dead fleece made another gay:
In him those holy antique hours are seen,
Without all ornament, itself and true,
Making no summer of another's green,
Robbing no old to dress his beauty new;

And him as for a map doth Nature store,
To show false Art what beauty was of yore."

We were drawn to this second paper by an able one from Heidelburg by Mr. Gust. Holzer in BACONIANA, July, 1907, touching ours in April, who, though generally approving our paper, seems unable to find any relation between the poem I.M. and Son. 68, and due, we think, wholly to the mentioned antedate.

As we purpose to give that interpretation of Son. 68 that shall live, in spite of the 1609 date, we have been compelled to draw it to some length.

This Sonnet is an important one in that it must ever indicate the line of demarcation between Bacon's first and second literary period. It has, however, a political significance in that it is a contrasting of the days of Queen Elizabeth with those of James I.

A knowledge of the mentioned cover words comes now to our aid, and shows us that the word "his" at the beginning of Son. 68 denotes its author. Note next its expressions, "these bastard signs of fair"; "the olden tresses of the dead" (an allusion to Queen Elizabeth); "the right of sepulchres were shorn away"; "to live a second life on second head"; "beauty's dead fleece" (his literature of the 1st period); "robbing no old to dress his beauty new" (the retailoring of the fleece of the 1st period); and "him as for a map doth Nature store." And see Son. 67 as to the state of the Times.

Taken in relation with the Sonnets touched, to what may "these bastard signs of fair" allude?

They are not the true signs of fair. No; but are designed to show that the author of the Sonnet had been dealt with in a crooked and untrue, or bastard, manner. These words have the same significance as the expression "crooked eclipses" in Son. 60,

"Crooked eclipses 'gainst his glory fight."

The real eclipse which the author of the Sonnets endured at his fall is mentioned in Son. 107, where he alludes to himself as "the mortal moon." That eclipse was not a true eclipse of the orb, but the crooked one of Son. 60.

Bacon says, "The fountain of honor is the King, and his aspect and the access to his person continueth honor in life, and to be banished from his presence is one of the greatest eclipses of honor that can be." —Ll. iv. 403.

In his essay "Of Great Place," he says:

"The standing is slippery, and the regress is either a downfall, or at least an eclipse, which is a melancholy thing."—See Sonnet 90.

We desire to open Son. 107 in an article by itself, so touch it no further here.

Note that the word "crooked," as applied to an eclipse, is unusual and significant.

In *Henry VIII.*, Act V. scene ii., we have:—

> "Men that make
> Envy and crooked Malice nourishment,
> Dare bite the best."

And *Cymb.* V. v.:—

> "Laud we the Gods;
> And let our crooked smokes climb to their nostrils
> From our bless'd altars!"

Bacon's Essay "Of Cunning" opens thus: "We take cunning to be a crooked wisdom." What do the words "cunning" and "my o'er pressed defense" in Son. 139 signify? (See Son. 149.) Again, "But I speak to you point blank: no crooked ends, either for myself or for others turn" (L.l. vii. 446). Note throughout his writings "the straight and crooked in the ways of nature." The plays abound in the use of these two words, and in exactly Bacon's sense of use.

Having touched these "bastard signs of fair," by

which the writer of the Sonnets was downed, let us next turn to the effect which he thought it would have on his philosophy—the "great basis for eternity" of Son. 124, 125—and which had been re-clothed or swaddled from the Babe in *Hamlet* until it had reached the form known as his Great Instauration, the tables of which are distinctly alluded to in Son. 122. Son. 124 opens thus:—

> "If my dear love were but the child of state,
> It might for Fortune's bastard be unfather'd."

These three Sonnets should be read in full and in relation. This love-wooing of truth was distinctly Baconian. In his "Essay on Truth" he says:—

"Yet truth, which only doth judge itself, teacheth that the inquiry of truth, which is the love-making or wooing of it, the knowledge of truth, which is the presence of it, and the belief of truth, which is the enjoying of it, is the sovereign good of human nature." And we find him ending a letter in 1622 thus: "Let our acquaintance be now established. Love me as you have begun, but love truth most. Farewell." (L.l. vii. 378.

Touching his comparison of this Babe, his Child of philosophy with the Ancients, see Son. 59.

We are thankful that there is one author who sees no mistress, no unlawful love, in the Sonnets; no, not even in Son. 152, which we would be glad to open.

We come now to the expression "the right of sepulchres were shorn away." By reason of his fall Bacon's sepulchre was shorn away, as well as his monument, and was bestowed upon his mask—Shake-speare—he himself making both epitaph and monument, as stated in Son. 81, which is in these words:—

> "Or I shall live your epitaph to make,
> Or you survive when I in earth am rotten;

From hence your memory death cannot take,
Although in me each part will be forgotten.
Your name from hence immortal life shall have,
Though I, once gone, to all the world must die:
The earth can yield me but a common grave,
When you entombed in men's eyes shall lie.
Your monument shall be my gentle verse,
Which eyes not yet created shall o'er read,
And tongues to be your being shall rehearse
When all the breathers of this world are dead;
You still shall live—such virtue hath my pen—
Where breath most breathes, even in the mouths of men."

This Sonnet tells the reader that there are two persons concerned in it—that one of the persons is to have but a common grave, and that it is the pen of the person that is to have but the common grave that made the monument for the other, and that whether or not he lived to make his epitaph. On what theory would William Shakespeare have penned this Sonnet if he had really been the author of it?

Bacon would not now permit the stain put upon his name to ruin his great volume on metaphysics—the plays—the wood-note postulates on what is in man, and to be later expanded.

Upon reading anew Son. 82, 83, in connection with others, a new thought looms before us, and in accord with our expressed views. Does Son. 81 allude to the King instead of to his mask, Shake-speare? We stay here for further search, and close this point in the words which Bacon puts into the mouth of Henry V. —a play in which he is himself largely self-centred—thus:—

"Either our history shall with full mouth,
Speak freely of our acts; or else our grave,
Like Turkish mute shall have a tongueless mouth
Not worshipp'd with a waxen epitaph."

—*Henry V.*, I. 2.

We come lastly to Bacon's awakening after his fall—namely, the living a new life on second head as stated in Son. 68. The first literary period became but the limbs to be later united to the new head of the second.

Bacon closes a petition to the House of Lords in 1621 for a release from his confinement in these words:—

"Herein your Lordships shall do a work of charity and nobility, you shall do me good, you shall do my creditors good, and it may be you shall do posterity good, if out of the carcass of dead and rotten greatness (as out of Samson's lion) there may be honey gathered for the use of future times."—"Bacon's Letters," Vol. VII., p. 321.

From *Cymb.* v. 5 we quote thus:—

"When as a lion's whelp shall to himself unknown, without seeking, find, and be embrac'd by a piece of tender air; and when from a stately cedar shall be lopp'd branches, which, being dead many years, shall after revive, be joined to the old stock, and freshly grow; then shall Posthumus end his miseries; Briton be fortunate, and flourish in peace and plenty."

In our quotation from Bacon's "Essay on Death" in our former paper we gave his enigmatic words, "but that name is lost; it is not now late but early."

Mr. Holzer did not tell us what he thought Bacon could mean by them. Did he allude to the mentioned loss of sepulchre, and a new morning for his pen, as touched in the Sonnet, and which was to be on a new basis? From the circumstances of his fall are these statements a just basis for the interpretation here given? In *The Tragedy of King Lear*, Act V. scene iii., we have:

"*Edg.* Know, my name is lost;
By treason's tooth bare-gnawn, and canker-bit:
Yet am I noble as the adversary
I come to cope."

Again, Bacon's preparation for the actors alluded to in our former paper concerns his second period and posterity.

Let the reader now read carefully Son. 70, 110, 119, and 123. Son. 119 ends thus :—

"O benefit of ill! now I find true
That better is by evil still made better;
And ruin'd love, when it is built anew,
Grows fairer than at first, more strong, far greater.
So I return, rebuked, to my content,
And gain by ill thrice more than I have spent."

After the new awakening, he, in Son. 100, 101, calls himself back to his dear love, his love-wooing of truth, as embodied in his philosophy. Son. 100 ends thus :—

"Return, forgetful Muse, and straight redeem
In gentle numbers time so idly spent;
Sing to the ear that doth thy lays esteem
And gives thy pen both skill and argument.
Rise, resty Muse, my love's sweet face survey,
If Time have any wrinkle graven there;
If any, be a satire to decay,
And make Time's spoils despised everywhere.
Give my love fame faster than Time wastes life;
So thou prevent'st his scythe and crooked knife."

And Son. 101 ends thus :—

"Make answer, Muse: wilt thou not haply say,
'Truth needs no colour, with his colour fix'd;
Beauty no pencil, beauty's truth to lay;
But best is best, if never intermix'd?'
Because he needs no praise, wilt thou be dumb?
Excuse not silence so; for 't lies in thee
To make him much outlive a gilded tomb,
And to be praised of ages yet to be.
Then do thy office, Muse; I teach thee how
To make him seem long hence as he shows now."

Touching his desire to protect himself and his philosophy "against confounding age's cruel knife," see Son. 55, 63, 64, 65, 107.

J. E. Roe.

South Lima, New York.

A FEW INTERROGATORIES.

WHILE preparing the manuscript, and also after the publication of the book entitled "An Impartial Study of the Shakespeare Title," certain questions were propounded to me and some statements were also made which (because records corroborating or confuting are all in England) I could neither answer, confirm nor disprove. I will briefly mention a few of them.

Note 1.—J. Payne Collier, in the first volume of his "Shakespeare's Complete Works," at page 70, asserts that William Shaksper is referred to in a letter from the poet and dramatist Samuel Daniel to Sir Thomas Egerton, preserved at Bridgewater House. Presuming that Mr. Collier's statement as to the letter and its place of deposit was correct, I inserted a copy of the letter, as printed by Collier, in the eleventh chapter of my book, and I undertook to show that the letter referred to Michael Drayton. Within a month after my book had been published, I received a letter from a learned and industrious Shakespearean scholar, in which he asserted that no such letter had ever been written by Daniel to the Lord Keeper, and he suggested that in future editions of my book, the eleventh chapter should be omitted.

Query 1.—Did Daniel ever write such a letter, and if he did, can the original be found? And who were the applicants in 1903 for the position of Master of the Queen's revels?

Note 2.—The following inscription was originally placed on the stone over William Shaksper's vault in the chancel of Trinity Church, Stratford.

"Good friend, for Jesus sake forbeare
To digg ye dust encloased here

Blesse be ye man y spares thes stones
And curst be he y moves my bones."

The statement has been made that the lines above quoted were merely copied from lines placed on other tombstones.

Query 2.—When the above inscription was placed on the stone which covered Shaksper's body, was it an inscription that was at that period either in common or occasional use? If the words were merely copied from similar inscriptions theretofore used in England that fact would tend to show that Shaksper's relatives, acquaintances and fellow-townsmen did not care very much about what became of his remains. It would also show that Appleton Morgan was right when, in his "Shakespeare in Fact and in Criticism," at page 85, he asked, "Why should we not honor William Shakespeare by opening his grave and enlisting all the resources of science to preserve whatever is mortal that may still be found therein—when every passing day leaves less and less to venerate? How much longer is this pious and patriotic duty to be delayed? While we are making our speeches about Shakespeare, organizing societies, and pageants, and writing books about him, we permit his actual bones to rot ignobly because some cobbler by an oversight of his betters managed to scratch a witch's palindrome upon the stone that was to cover them. It is ridiculous."

Note 3.—When *Hamlet* first appeared in quarto the play contained 2,143 lines, but in the folio of 1623 it contained 3,765 lines, showing an addition of 1,622 lines. *Henry V.* was revised by the addition of 1,900 new lines. *Much Ado About Nothing* and *King Lear* were greatly altered. *Titus Andronicus* obtained a new scene. Other revisions and additions were made and Michael Drayton, Thomas Dekker and Francis Bacon have been suggested as the revisionists.

Query 3.—Who should receive the credit for the principal additions and amendments to and the revision of the several plays? And why?

Note 4.—The most puzzling question propounded to me is based upon a quotation from a poem of Michael Drayton, descriptive of poets, addressed to his friend, Henry Reynolds. The lines read thus :—

"And be it said of thee"
"Shakespeare, thou hadst as smooth a comic vein
Fitting the sock, and in thy natural brain
As strong conception and as clear a rage
As any one that trafficked with the stage."

Query 4.—To whom did Drayton refer? If William Shaksper was an ignorant and illiterate fellow, would not the fact of his ignorance and consequent inability to write or revise plays have been known to the actors and playwrights of that era? Could Drayton, who was something of a wag, have been referring to himself, or was he referring to Thomas Dekker, who, we know, had the smooth comic vein and the strong brain-conception which Drayton specifies?

There are two other queries important only in that an investigation may lead to more careful search and inquiry in more important matters affecting the authorship of the Shakespeare plays and furnishing at least the actual truth.

Who was Anna Whately, of Temple Grafton, who on November 27th, 1582, was named in the marriage license issued to William Shaxpere? Was she the widow of one Hathaway? She could not have been a child of Richard Hathaway, of Shottery, for he had no child whose Christian name was Anna or Anne.

Again, after William Shaksper's death, was his widow again married, and if so, to whom? Did she become Mrs. Richard James?

A continuous and systematic search ought to be made

for old letters, documents and records throughout England to ascertain, if possible, who the mellifluous Shakespeare really was. The world wants to know the truth and to give credit where the credit is actually due.

JOHN H. STOTSENBURG.

DR. APPLETON MORGAN INTERVIEWED.

THE readers of BACONIANA may be interested in the following interview with Dr. Appleton Morgan, or in parts thereof. As Dr. Morgan is printing in *New Shakespeareana* such parts of his Autobiography as touch on the rise and progress of the Bacon-Shakespeare agitation in the United States, it occurred to me to sound him as to his own present attitude on that controversy.

I found him in his library (which he undignifies by calling it a "Den") at Westfield, New Jersey, across the Watchung Mountains from my home. Mr. Morgan, being a widower, escapes most of the small details of existence by living at his Clubs, in New York City, though the approach of Spring usually finds him settled at Westfield for his summer home. He is a lawyer, retired from the active pursuits of his profession, which were occupied during his active life with the affairs of two of the largest American Railway systems, for each of which he was respectively counsel. I found him a gentleman slightly under the average stature, the build of many of the world's workmen—Napoleon, Nelson, Hamilton—men who have done their full share of what the world calls "work." He looks somewhat older, perhaps, than his years. We plunged at once into the question.

I said, "*I have followed your Bacon-Shakespeare Biography, Dr. Morgan; I want to ask if you are still the sceptic of old times?*"

"Well, something of the sceptic still, but now my scepticism is rather confined to speculating whether the gentlemen who claim a complete Stratfordian origin of the plays, actually and absolutely accept the standard biographies of him. If, in short, they mean what they say, or wink when they say it—or laugh when they pass each other, like Roman augurs; or satisfy their consciences by some mental reservation. As if one should say, 'Goethe was the grandest intellect Germany has ever produced'; 'Well, who was Goethe?' 'O, Goethe was a chimney-sweep in Weimar, but he was such a bright and clever little chap that everybody wanted him and nobody else to clean their chimneys.' That, to my mind, is a proposition not too bizarre for a faith like that of those who say the Shakespeare of the biographies was the Dramatist of these immortal and oceanic plays."

"*In other words, Doctor, you are a sceptic?*"

"Well, the question absorbs me as much to-day as it did thirty years ago when I stumbled upon it first, and I have sort of come to be not an investigator so much as of counsel (as lawyers say) to the Heretics. It seems to me an absorbing literary question, as one vastly more important than a question of split infinitives or of a distributive pronoun, and one that has yet to be thoroughly argued by astute counsel who would cover every possible phase of it, and cover it once for all, to a competent tribunal, in their briefs. The Shakespeareans, for example, weaken their case when they say where Shakespeare was born—give the traditions and clumsy records, show us those pitiful relics, and cicerone us through that poor little scrubbed-up hovel on Henley Street. The only right way, from the

orthodox standpoint, is that taken by Prof. Walter Raleigh, who tells us, point-blank, that Shakespeare was a demi-god with a soul always in the Empyrean; or Prof. Baynes, who, while admitting that Shakespeare actually walked on earth, yet had him educated at a Stratford grammar-school of Prof. Baynes' own construction, where the curriculum was inclusive of all the classics, all the physical sciences, and, in fact, of all the humanities put together—such a course of studies as no University the world had ever seen to this day, except, possibly, the grammar-school at Ipswich, which Cardinal Wolsey drew up on paper. I congratulate from the bottom of my heart the gentlemen who believe in the Stratfordian authorship of Shakespeare. Such faith can move mountains—I wish I had half as much! The boldest Shakespearean of them all is a Dr. Anders, of the University of Greifswald, in Germany. That gentleman has lately published a volume, "Shakespeare's Books," in which he gives a list of between three and four hundred works in Greek, Latin, and perhaps Hebrew, which Shakespeare had read; works of which most of us had never even heard the titles, which list proves Shakespeare to have been a Porson, a Bentley, and a Gladstone rolled into one, and, moreover, reveals Ben Jonson as a base maligner when he declared that Shakespeare had small Latin and less Greek.

"After reading Dr. Anders' book, the wonder is that the plays and poems are not ten thousand times more learned than they are. If all the Shakespeareans had the courage of Dr. Anders, the Baconians would find themselves up against a pretty stiff fight.

"The Baconians are even more simple. Their error is, in basing their case on Parallelisms; that is, on similarities in passages in the plays and in Bacon, which appeal to themselves, *in camera*, no doubt, as identities, but which are always the critics' opportunity to laugh

the whole Bacon case to scorn and derision. The wonder would be if there were no parallelisms in the writings of two master-minds living in the same town, in the same years. But as cumulative evidence (once having shown a *prima facie* case), many of these parallellisms are almost final. Three or four thousand of them can't be pooh-poohed away as 'accident.' The anti-Shakespearean presumption should be proved —if at all—by purely circumstantial evidence, such as the results of the most penetrative and scrupulous and house-to-house search through Elizabethan London for a man or men with the equipment imperative to write the plays—the appearance of the First Folio at a date when there was no market for it, and under a false editorial assignment—the known record of the titular author as a man of affairs—the absence of his name in all literary fellowship, and things like that. Why, you may be unprepared for my telling you that I have tried infinitely harder to find a trace of William Shakespeare in the plays than I have tried to frame anti-Shakespearean or sceptic literature.

"And we must not only search for a man with the equipment required, but we must find that that same man wrote his mother tongue as no other man or men wrote it. I will admit that when I wrote "The Shakesperean Myth," thirty years ago, I didn't know so much as I should have known about Bacon. You remember that the sub-title to that work was "William Shakespeare and Circumstantial Evidence." But when I came to read Bacon I really felt that I had been on the right track, or, at least, on a right track. Bacon's English seems to have flowed, in spite of himself, into either the exquisite or the stately, even when setting down the merest details. Listen to this from his perfunctory 'Wisdom of the Ancients': 'And this principally raises my esteem of these fables, which I

perceive, not as the product of the age nor invention of the Poets, but as sacred relics, gentle whispers, and the breath of better times—that, from the traditions of more ancient nations, came at length into the flutes and trumpets of the Greek.' Or this—the last paragraph in the 'History of Henry the Seventh'—and I should like to have somebody show me a nobler sentence in English: 'He was born at Pembroke Castle, and lieth buried at Westminster in one of the statliest and daintiest monuments of Europe, both for the chapel and for the sepulchre. So that he dwelleth more richly dead in the monument of his tomb than he did alive in Richmond or any of his palaces. I could wish that he did the like in this monument of his fame.' How could anybody, hunting for a great master of English, fail to be attracted by sentences like these, in which the merest narrative or category runs into a march like the march of an epic or a familiar sweetness like pastoral poetry?

"The struggle with me has been to believe in Shakespeare, not to believe in Bacon. I even went to the labour of writing a book of three hundred and fifty pages to show that there actually were traces of a Stratfordian authorship in the Plays, but what does that book amount to? I found three coarse (as Bacon would have said, 'smutty') things, too vile to quote, in which the *double éntendre* depended upon a Warwickshireism. And I found some hundreds of Warwickshireisms, something like from one to twenty in a single Play; to which my always gentle critic, Mrs. Pott, overlooking the *secundum quid*, answered that these Warwickshireisms were common to all British dialects. So, as long as there is no consensus of the Baconian proposition, the Shakespeareans have the right to 'stand pat' (an expressive slang) on the presumption of three hundred years, but the moment they cut loose from that presumption they have naught to

do but to stand mute—they cannot prove the unprovable.

"What lawyer would not glory in a presumption three centuries old? Who can go behind such a presumption of time as that? To disturb it would be like tampering with ancient landmarks, *Interest Respublica ut fit finis legationem, Stare decisis,* and more law-jargon to the same effect. Apropos of this study in the Warwickshire dialect, I may tell a curious story. When *The Nation* came to review it they sent it to a certain Prof. Kittridge of some Massachusetts college to prepare the notice. It was in July, and a pretty hot season, and this gentleman, I suppose, was suffering from the weather, or did not happen to have his paper knife at hand, and so fell back upon the presumption that any book on a Shakespeare matter, written by Appleton Morgan, would be 'tainted with Baconianism.' And so this gentleman wrote a scathing review. I remember reading into it for some distance before suspecting that it was my own book that was being reviewed, since, whereas it was the one book I ever wrote to try and prove that Shakespeare actually wrote 'Shakespeare,' this Prof. Kittridge damned it as ignorant, worthless, and not worth the paper it was printed on. Doubtless being written to prove that Shakespeare did after all write 'Shakespeare,' it was all that! But the point is, that, for once, an orthodox Shakespearean kicked his own case out of court."

"*Then, Dr. Morgan, you have written books on both sides of the controversy?*"

"Yes, I suppose I have; I wanted to be fair, don't you see?"

"*But I suppose you saw 'that the Whig dogs got the worst of it?*'"

"I am not so sure of that. There is a good deal to be said for Shakespeare. As for myself, I can truth-

fully say again that I have tried harder to find Shakespeare in the plays than I have tried to find Bacon in them.

"But don't think much of parallelisms, as I said. They seem to me to be the weak points rather than the strong points of the Bacon case. The temptation of your parallelism-gatherer is to gather as many as possible; and no matter how startling or how strong most of them are, he is sure to get in one or two that don't appeal to or convince anybody but himself, and your book reviewer will find his opportunity right there, and resort to the old trick that has been used to damn books so long that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, namely, to pick out the weakest—while he claims to select at random—and riddle them for the whole structure. Lawyers know that the only way to make a strong case is not to have any weak points. If you convince your jury, why—stop! If you don't, the next point may not appeal to him and, like as not, will set him to reviewing his own opinion. The juryman who says, 'Well, your case is perfect, but I don't know about the last point,' is almost always a lost juryman for you, and once you have lost him you never catch him more.

"I can show you in dozens of parallelisms in these books (pointing to the bookshelves which lined the 'den') which need an explanation as recondite as themselves. Here is one for example:

Bacon.	Shakespeare.
It was to show my skill That more for praise than purpose meant to kill, That out of question so it is at times, Glory grows guilty of detested crimes.	I am of his opinion that said pleasantly that it is a shame to him that is a suitor to the mistress to make love to the waiting-woman.

"Now here is a book written by a gentleman who has done yeoman service in the controversy, who actually cites this as a parallelism *inter alia* between Bacon and Shakespeare. Imagine the glee of a jaded book-reviewer who knows nothing of the merits of the controversy, or don't bother even to read the book he is set to damn, over a recondite parallelism like that. The explanation is given in a footnote thus:—'Virtue is the mistress and Praise the waiting-woman in Bacon's analogy.' And Bacon holds that we should cultivate virtue not for the sake of praise, but for its own's sake! which rather makes it worse than better, don't you think?

"Imagine the Horse Reporter of a great daily newspaper, who happened to be at leisure, called in to review a profound book like Holmes's 'Authorship of Shakespeare.' He would need only to open at that page to wipe the office floor with the entire volume. (I must add, however, that that 'parallelism' is not from Judge Holmes's book.)

"Of course, you say that is only one of two thousand, and, taken with something else, shows the bent of Shakespeare's mind. But your casual reader don't care anything about 'the bent of Bacon's mind,' and the casual reader is the man you are after. What Baconians should do is to pound away at the circumstantial evidence, and quote as few parallelisms as possible, and those only such as, by no mundane possibility, could be coincidence or accident."

"*Are there any such, Dr. Morgan?*"

"Yes, I think there are about ten or twelve that no two persons would state so exactly alike unless they were identities in something more than a common language, had pursued identical studies, made identical mistakes, held identical prejudices, and so on. Mr. Donnelly has listed some scores of these circumstantial

identities and it would have been rather hard to get away from his demonstrations if he himself had not killed himself with his 'cipher.' He deliberately buried the best work of his life, and while the evil that he did lives after him, like Bacon's, the good he did is interred with his bones. So let it be with Cæsar!"

"*Am I to tell my people, then, that you are a Baconian?*"

"When asked that question," replied Dr. Morgan, "I always say that I know no surer way of making people lose all interest in you or your opinions than to foreclose yourself by announcing that you think so and so and have made up your mind once and for all. No, I think I will remain in equilibrium 'on the fence.' Then perhaps somebody on one side or the other might listen to what I say. If I announce myself as committed, neither side will value my output—one side, because they believe in me, and the other side because they don't. This I will say, however, that there is no reason that I know of why we should not call the author of the plays 'William Shakespeare.' Only don't write biographies of a man of that name or something that sounds like it, who flourished in Stratford-on-Avon and so on, and ask us to accept the two as one and the same man, for faith in that case is not the evidence of things unseen."

Dr. Morgan is a gentleman of means sufficient to live a life of leisure and to indulge himself in antiquarian and Shakespearean pursuits. He has behind him a record of thirty-five or more large printed volumes and monographs, and feels proud of the distinction that, although his opinions have never been of conventional type, not even the most ignorant or the most hostile book reviewer has ever said that his published opinions were ridiculous or illogical. No work of his in thirty years has failed to not only attract attention, but respectful attention. Perhaps Dr. Morgan's only handi-

cap is (as he himself confesses) that if he finds too many people agreeing with him, his unfaith in the verdict of the Market-place leads him to lose confidence in his own conclusions and to set himself about enquiring how to modulate or recant them. If he had lived in the days of the Index he would have escaped the Auto da Fé.

JOHN LANE.

Essex Fells, New Jersey, March 29th, 1908.

THE RESPONSE TO DR. ANDERS' CHALLENGE.

[A summary of the correspondence which recently took place between Mr. B. Frank Carpenter, the editor of *New Shakespeareana*, and Dr. Anders, of Heidelburg appeared on pages 135—137 of the last issue of BACONIANA. The following marks the next stage in the controversy, and is reprinted from the April number of *New Shakespeareana*, pages 55—60.]

DR. MORGAN'S dictum that Shakespeareans answer the Bacon Hypothesists by looking the other way is no longer reliable. For, in our last issue, Dr. Anders, the most recent of the Shakespearean Protagonists (and nathless the bravest, since, although his eminent predecessor, Gervinus, had said that in more than forty given instances the expressions of Shakespeare and of Bacon were identical (Commentaries, edition of 1849), and "that in Bacon's Maxims lie as it were the whole theory of Shakespeare's Dramatic forms and of his moral philosophy," Dr. Anders had boldly asserted that no traces of Bacon could anywhere be found in Shakespeare. But Dr. Anders did not rest contented, as many another Shakespearean has

done with the mere assertion, and a refusal to maintain it, like a Lutheran Thesis, against all comers. In NEW SHAKESPEAREANA for January, 1908, he challenged Baconians to produce ten coincidences between Bacon and Shakespeare " not accountable for as Accidents! The committee we invited to meet this challenge we regret to say was inconvenient. But, out of their communications, I have been deputed to select eleven coincidences to be submitted to the learned Theban. The corrolary suggested being that if Dr. Anders pronounces these eleven coincidences "Accidents," then he confronts himself with the greatest coincidence of all, to wit: That of eleven random "Accidents," every one of them points to a single and identical solution of a literary problem.

COINCIDENCE NUMBER ONE.

On the seventeenth day of April, 1593, in London, Francis Bacon was arrested for debt at the process of a Jew named Sympson, and thrown into a sponging house. Bacon applied for succour to his brother Anthony Bacon, and Anthony raised the money and released his younger brother. In the same year 1593 there was written, and divers times acted in London, a play called The Merchant of Venice, until its acting value having been satisfied, it was printed in Quarto in 1600. In this play, the debtor is one Bassanio (which might not or might suggest Bacon), but the good friend who redeems him is Antonio, which is certainly the Italian form of "Anthony," and the remorseless creditor is "Shylock the Jew," near enough, under the circumstances, to "Sympson the Jew."

COINCIDENCE NUMBER TWO.

In The Winter's Tale, Perdita, cast away when a babe and rescued and reared among Bohemian shep-

herds; when the Sicillian nobles discover her presents them each with a nosegay, with speeches which together are an exceedingly close paraphrase of Bacon's "Essay on Gardens." Dr. Anders can read the paraphrase for himself.

Coincidence Number Three.

Between the first and second Quarto version of Hamlet there occurs a varient in statement as to the constituents of certain heavenly bodies. Also between the dates at which these two Quartos were printed, Bacon published a treatise "Cogitatione de Natura Rerum," in which he rejected the theory of the Earth having been a moulten mass with fire at its core, and maintained that the earth is a cold mass. The parallelization between the two Quarto versions show the same change in theory as to the earth being fire.

The First Quarto Hamlet, 1603.	Second Quarto Hamlet, 1604.
Doubt that in earth is fire,	Doubt thou the stars are fire,
Doubt that the stars do move.	Doubt that the sun doth move.

But this is not the only touch of Bacon in this extraordinary love-letter. Bacon rejected the Copernican theory that the sun was stationary, and to state the extreme of vagary, he says "doubt that the sun doth move."

Coincidence Number Four.

Again in Hamlet we have a change in the text of the first Quarto—this time by an omission in the second Quarto.

The Second Quarto Hamlet, 1604.	First Folio, 1623.
Sense, sure you have,	(Omitted.)
Else could you not have motion.	Restored in modern editions. Acts III. Sc. IV., 71.

Simultaneously in the 1605 edition of the Advance-

ment of Learning, Bacon held to the doctrine of the old philosophers, that everything that moves has sensibility, or as capable of sensation. But in his 1623 edition, he recedes from that position and expressly declared the doctrine untrue, and that there could be motion in inanimate and insentient bodies—as, for example, in the planets.

Coincidence Number Five.

On a single page of Bacon's Commonplace Book or Memoranda Book in which he jotted down catch words to suggest to him or remind him of matters he wished to recur to at convenience, these entries :

Rome Qui a bon voison a bon matin Golden slepe
The Larke Abed rouse out bed Uprouse You are Up

appear upon a single page.

Dr. E. A. Abott, author of The Shakespearean Grammar and other Shakespeare works, is obliged to admit that, according to the habitude of literary persons—these entries seem to have been used as memoranda in framing this passage from the Romeo and Juliet, (or never used at all !) thus ;

"Young man it argues a distempered head
So soon to bid good morrow to thy bed
Care keeps his watch in every old man's eye
And where care lodges sleep will never lie
But where unbruised youth with unstuffed brain
Doth couch his limbs there golden sleep doth reign."

being Friar Lawrence's greeting to Romeo on his early appearance at his cell (Romeo and Juliet II, iii. 133).

Coincidence Number Six.

In the De Augmente Scientarium, Bacon says "Is not the opinion of Aristotle to be regarded where he saith that young men are not fit auditors of moral philosophy because they are not settled from the boil-

ing heat of their affections nor attuned by time and experience."

And in Troilus and Cressida we have the same allusion

> Unlike young men whom Aristotle thought
> Unfit to hear moral Philosophy.

But what Aristotle did say was, not that young men ought not to hear Moral Philosophy, but that they should not study Political Philosophy! So that, whoever wrote the De Augmente and whoever wrote the Troilus and Cressida made the identical mismemorization of Aristotle.

Coincidence Number Seven.

Othello was first published, in 1622, in Quarto (Shakespeare having died in 1616). In 1623 it was reprinted in the Folio, with many important additions, among which was this passage:

> "Like to the Pontic sea
> Whose icy current and compulsive course
> Ne'er feels retiring ebb, but keeps right on
> To the Proponticke and the Hellespont."

"A short time previously, Bacon had been studying the phenomena of tides and currents, and had discovered the fact that the current in the Bosphorus always runs from east to west. He derived it from George Sandy's Travels, published in 1615, and used it in his posthumous treatise, *De Fluxu et Refluxu Maris*, written after 1615, and before 1623."

Coincidence Number Eight.

The Northumberland Manuscript should be submitted as a most astounding item of circumstantial Evidence of the more or less identity in literary output of Shakespeare and of Bacon. This manuscript has been described so minutely and examined so carefully

so many times in NEW SHAKESPEAREANA (Vol. I, p. 122, Vol. V, 118, 128, Vol. VI, p. 57) that it is only necessary to say that neither Prof. Anders nor anybody else can rail the seal from off that bond! A scrivener, trying his pen, scrawls the names "Bacon" "William Shakespeare" over and over; upon a single page also the names of sundry of their writings together with here and there words or sentences from those works. If there is any reason why this "Northumberland manuscript (or what there is left of it) is not circumstantial evidence of a coincidence of some sort between the two identities—that reason has never been stated.

COINCIDENCE NUMBER NINE.

It is a startling coincidence that Lord Bacon, with abundance of leisure after his fall, should plan and execute a life of Henry the Seventh, beginning it at the precise point at which the Shakespeare Play of Henry the Sixth ended, and closing it at the precise point at which the Shakespeare Play of Henry the Eighth began.

COINCIDENCE NUMBER TEN.

The fat knight in the two parts of Henry the Sixth was at first Sir John Oldcastle. When the Cobham family protested and the Lord Chamberlain ordered the name changed, he became "Sir John Falstaff." The origin of the name is beyond our guessing, unless a fact first pointed out by Judge Phelps gives us the clue. Says Judge Phelps "One of the famous cases of the day, the decision in which settled the action of assumpsit upon a firm basis, was Slade's Case, reported by Coke. The case was twice argued before all the Judges in England. It was pending from 1596 to 1602. Francis Bacon was counsel and associated with him as attorney on the same side as was John Halstaff.

When the author of the first part of Henry the Fourth found himself obliged to find some other name than to substitute for Sir John Oldcastle and to find it in a hurry, did he get it from the name of John Halstaff?

Coincidence Number Eleven.

In the first part of Henry the Sixth, Act II, Scene III, there is a parley between the English and French armies, for which there is no historical authority. Jeanne d'Arc addresses the Duke of Burgundy in long speech of thirty-three lines, which speech is an absolutely faithful blank-verse version of a letter written by the Maid of Orleans to the then Duke of Burgundy dated July 17, 1429. But this letter never saw the light of print until, in 1780 the Historian of the House of Burgundy, M. Brugiere de Barante, found it among the papers of that house. (Prof. Anders will find this letter printed in full in Edwin Reed's "Coincidences Between Bacon and Shakespeare" Boston—Coburn Publishing Company, 1906). The main incident in Love's Labours Lost—the embassy of the court beauties to procure a remission for France of a tribute due the King of Navarre which France found it inconvenient to pay—in the hope that the fascinations and blandishments of the French ladies would conquer a susceptible King—is the employment of an actual occurrence. But that occurrence was, in court affairs, so minor a record, that it is chronicled nowhere in any published History. It was not unearthed until found by Joseph Hunter in 1847. But Lord Bacon spent his early life in France as an attaché of an English ambassador, and certainly might—so far as opportunity went—have seen both these unpublished records. But unless the standard biographies of him are all wrong, William Snakespeare certainly could not have seen them.

Out of, perhaps, three or four thousand coincidences,

which by the patience of scholars, have been unearthed —possibly the eleven above given—out of which Dr. Anders can select his desired ten—are as apparent, to to the general, and require as less an intimate familiarity with the works of both writers—as any others.

JOSEPH SOHMERS.

REVIEWS.

Shakespeare's Warwickshire Contemporaries.

By Mrs. C. C. Stopes. Published by the Shakespeare Head Press, Stratford-on-Avon. 253 pages, royal crown 8vo. 7/6 net.

A NEW edition, revised and enlarged, is published of Mrs. C. C. Stopes' "Shakespere's Warwickshire Contemporaries." The earlier edition was a reprint of twelve articles which appeared in the *Stratford-upon-Avon Herald*. In the preface the authoress states: "I originally selected my subject on account of some relation, real or imaginary, which I believed they might have had to Shakespere." The book bears evidence of an enormous amount of laborious research, which is set out in nineteen chapters. One of the most interesting is that in which Richard Field, the printer (1561-1625), and his connections are described. Amongst the latter, prominence is given to Thomas Vautrollier, whom he served under as apprentice for six years. Field, in the order of succession of Master Printers, is said to have married his widow and succeeded to the business; but elsewhere it is stated that he married the daughter. The account of the books printed and issued by these two men is very instructive. Mrs. Stopes does not produce a scrap of evidence to prove that Shakespere knew Field or was in any way associated with him. Although she states (p. 67): "Imagination must not run riot in critical studies of Shakespeare," she gives free scope to her fancy. Here are some of her imaginings taken from the chapter on Field.

"When Shakespere went to London as a stranger what would be more natural to him than to go straight to Richard Field, avail himself of his metropolitan knowledge, and very probably share his lodgings? He would want to know all about his friend's occupation, as he wanted to know about most things, and he learned a good deal about it."

"We have only to follow Shakespere up to Richard Fields' home and office in Blackfriars to find him planted in a good reference library in the very midst of opportunities such as his works show he could take advantage of."

"The six years he (Field) spent with Vautrollier were those that determined his after career, and, as I think, had a strong influence over Shakespere. If Shakespere went up after the sad settlement with the Lamberts in 1587 he might be present at Richard's wedding and Vautrollier's funeral, and see his old friend installed at the head of the establishment."

"In some of the Sonnets there are such evident traces of the influence of Giordano Bruno that I long wondered how Shakespeare could have came in contact with him. That philosopher had, it is true, lectured in Oxford in 1583, but one could hardly fit Shakespere into a university lecture room. He had visited in 1582 Sir Fulke Greville and Sir Philip Sidney in London; yet we cannot imagine Shakespere in their company then. But in Vautrollier's shop the sayings of Bruno would acquire tragic interest at his death for a philosophic faith, and not only from the copy kept in the secret cupboard (!), but from the conversation of the workmen, Shakespere may have picked up some of these."

"During the years that Shakespeare, homeless, and uncertain of a future, apprenticed to no trade, educated to no profession, inheritor of no property, was being driven with the wind and tossed till he should find a shore, it seems to me that he spent much time and study in Master Field's treasure house. . . . While studying the actor's parts which he played, or the old dramas that he patched and tinkered whereby he earned his bread, or the books in Field's shop, wherein he forgot his sorrows, there had dawned upon him the conviction that he, too, was a poet. Was it Ovid or Puttenham during the plague year that acted as the immediate cause? We know not."

"I have elsewhere shown how the Earl of Southampton, by active kindness and warm-hearted sympathy, stimulated Shakespere to a new effort to 'graver labours.'"

"Though Shakespere seems to have studied some of Field's later publications we find no proof of further connection between these Stratford men."

These are some of the gems of imagination in which the lady indulges who lays down the sound principle that "imagination must not run riot in critical studies in Shakespeare." There is no grain of evidence or even tradition of any connection between Shakespere and Field, but of course it was Field who entered in the Stationers' Register a book entitled "Venus and Adonis," by William Shake-speare.

A chapter is devoted to each of three bearers of the title of Sir Thomas Lucy, 1532-1600—1551-1605—and 1585-1640. Again, no evidence is advanced of any acquaintance between any one of the three and Shakespere, though, speaking of the elder Sir Thomas Lucy, it is said: "He must often have come into contact with Shakespere." But we have no clue to the circumstance thereof. Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps says, "No record of the least value bearing directly on the Shakespere traditions has ever been found in

Charlecote (Outlines, Vol. II. 383), and the minutes of the Court of Records and the Chamberlain's accounts are likewise silent."

Mrs. Stopes will have none of the Justice Shallow caricature, and deals very fully with the character. She says :—"I am sure that 'Shallow' was not intended to represent Sir Thomas Lucy; that there was no foundation for the tradition, and that the whole story was built upon a misreading of Shakespere's plays and a misunderstanding of his art." Yet there is more confirmation and probability of the truth of this tradition than there is of most of those which have been handed down.

The connection between Bacon and the second Sir Thomas Lucy is mentioned, and the letter written by Bacon to him is reproduced from the supplement to Rawley's "Resuscitatio."

This is a noteworthy passage from the chapter on "The Grevilles and Lord Brooke": "It is always considered strange that such a man (Fulke Greville) should not have mentioned Shakespeare."

In writing of Dr. John Hall, Mrs. Stopes refers to the death of his mother-in-law, "the love of Shakespere's youth," and continues: "The touching ideas of her epitaph were doubtless his wife's, put into his Latin, but they go far to repel the unpleasant suggestions so many writers on Shakespere have made on Anne Hathaway." The unpleasant suggestions usually have reference to Shakespere's treatment of his wife; but there is no word as to this, nor any fact as to any tradition or circumstance in which he and his daughter and son-in-law are together connected.

The account of Michael Drayton is distinctly good; but here, also, Mrs. Stopes lapses into imagination run riot, when she states that: "We may safely picture him (Drayton) pacing the streets of Stratford by Anne's side, or dropping into New Place to have a chat with Shakespere.

There is a chapter on "The Clergy of Stratford" and another on "The Schoolmasters." In the latter it is said that "Alexander Aspinall was probably a friend, certainly an acquaintance, and might very well have helped the poet's later culture." To those who take an interest in Warwickshire Worthies of the past, the volume will be of value, but the ordinary reader must say "Cui bono?" Certainly when he has read it he will not be less ignorant about Shakespere than he was before he began it.

The Shakespeare Problem Re-stated.

By G. G. Greenwood, M.P., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law, sometime Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge. Published by John Lane, The Bodley Head. 21/- nett. 523 pp. demy 8vo.

MR. GREENWOOD is wise in his generation. In re-stating the Shakespeare Problem he has taken the offensive. He enters the

field thoroughly equipped for the contest, and so effectively does he wage war that he does not merely dislodge and rout his opponents, but he follows up success after success until he leaves them entirely annihilated. No book has been issued on the subject so overwhelming in argument, so piercing in criticism, so convincing in effect. The problem considered is whether William Shakespere, the Stratford man, was the author of the Plays published under the name of William Shakespeare. There is no attempt made to find out who was the author. Mr. Greenwood says in his preface:—"I hold no brief for the Baconians, though, like Mr. Gladstone, 'I have always regarded their discussion as one perfectly serious and to be respected.'" He continues: "The question, then, is a matter of evidence and reasonable probability—Was Shakspere the Player identical with Shakespeare the Poet? It seems to me that that question must, on full consideration of the whole matter, be answered in the negative, and in this work I have endeavoured to state some of the reasons which, as it seems to me, make for that conclusion."

The subject is naturally divided into two portions. In the first place Shakspere of Stratford is considered, followed by chapters on the Schooling of Shakspere; Shakspere and "Genius;" Later Life and Death of Shakspere; The Traditional Shakspere. It is to be expected that the remarkable contributions of Mr. Sidney Lee to the discussion should meet with the author's attention. Mr. Greenwood opens his case with an extract from a letter published in the *Times* of January 8th, 1902, in which Mr. Lee states: "Patient investigation, which has been in progress for more than two hundred years, has brought together a mass of biographical detail which far exceeds that accessible in the case of any poet contemporary with Shakespeare." Mr. Greenwood remarks thereon: "There is an audacity about the statement which borders on the sublime," and he cites in support of this view the late J. R. Green, who, in his "History of the English People," says: "Of hardly any poet do we know so little"; Mr. C. W. Crook, B.A., B.Sc., editor of many Shakespearean Plays for educational purposes, who writes: "Of the fifty-two years of his life in which he played his part, the most careful research has discovered but a few meagre incidents." He might also have cited Mr. Churton Collins, but of that more anon. From this point forward the work follows Mr. Sidney Lee's "Life of Shakespeare," considering such biographical facts as are adduced from it—facts resting upon evidence and not upon theory or imagination. The author contends "that such facts are meagre and unsatisfactory in the extreme." How utterly worthless and misleading is this Life, "which some look upon as an epoch-making work," the reader will appreciate as he accompanies Mr. Greenwood through the chapters which have been referred to. The lie is nailed to the counter that "Good ground is here offered for the belief that the poet's father wielded a practised pen," reiterated in the sentence: "When

attesting documents he occasionally made his mark, but there is evidence in the Stratford archives that he could write with facility." Mr. Greenwood asks for the production of at least one authentic document undoubtedly attested by John Shakspere with his autograph signature, and adds: "Until this is produced the 'sceptics' may well be content *stare super antiquas vias*." The chapter on Shakspere and Genius is closely reasoned, and in addition to the arguments of Mr. Lee, those of Mr. Churton Collins and Sir Theodore Martin are ruthlessly exposed.

The other side of the Problem is dealt with in chapters on The Learning of Shakespeare; Shakespeare Allusions and Illusions; Shakespeare as a Lawyer; Shakespeare as Naturalist; and The Silence of Philip Henslowe. It would be impossible to write about *the learning of Shakespeare* without copious reference to Mr. Churton Collins' able essays on the subject.

This is not the first time that in the columns of BACONIANA cordial appreciation has been given to the splendid services rendered by Mr. Churton Collins to the cause advocated in them. If an action to determine the Problem was being tried, counsel contending that the man whom Messrs. Garnett and Gosse designated "the Stratford Rustic" was not the author of the poems and plays, after calling Mr. Churton Collins and putting in a series of his articles, might with confidence leave his case in the hands of the judge and jury. Mr. Greenwood could not justify his contention more absolutely than by citing the following paragraph from Mr. Collins' critque on *Lee's Life of Shakespeare* :—

"More than a century ago George Stevens wrote: 'All that can be known with any degree of certainty about Shakespeare is that he was born at Stratford-on-Avon, married and had children there, went to London, where he commenced actor, *wrote poems and plays*,* returned to Stratford, made his will, died, and was buried there.' And, if we set aside probable inferences, this is all we do know of any importance about his life. His pedigree cannot certainly be traced beyond his father. Nothing is known of his education—that he was educated at the Stratford Grammar School is pure assumption. His life between his birth and the publication of *Venus and Adonis* is an absolute blank. It is at least doubtful whether the supposed allusion to him in Greene's 'Groat's Worth of Wit' and in Chettle's 'Kind Heart's Dream' have any reference to him at all; it is still more doubtful whether the William Shakespeare of Adrian Quiney's letter, or of the Rogers and Addenbroke summonses, or the William Shakespeare who was assessed for property in St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, was the poet. We know practically nothing of his life in London or of the date of his arrival in London; we are ignorant of the date of his return to Stratford ,of his happiness or unhappiness in married life, of his habits, of his

* The words in italics must, of course, be omitted as they would constitute the point at issue in the trial.

last days, of the cause of his death. Not a sentence that fell from his lips has been authentically recorded. At least one-half of the alleged facts of his biography is as purely apocryphal as the Life of Homer attributed to Herodotus."*

Could counsel have a better witness? Then let him put in from Mr. Churton Collins' *Studies in Shakespeare,* the articles on Shakespeare as a Classical Scholar; Sophocles and Shakespeare; Shakespeare as a Prose Writer, and The Bacon-Shakespeare Mania; † and from *Ephemera Critica* those on the Religion of Shakespeare, and the Sonnets of Shakespeare, and he would not require any improvement to be made. It might spoil a case that would be too strong to tamper with. If the question as to whether Bacon was the author of the poems and plays were also to be put to the jury the case would still be strong enough, especially if the importance of Mr. Collins' masterly essay on the Prose of Shakespeare was insisted on, and the chapter on "His Age" from the commentaries of Dr. Gervinus was also put in evidence.

How completely Mr. Greenwood is in accord with Mr. Collins the following extracts will testify :—

"Finally Mr. Collins claims to have demonstrated 'that Shakespeare could read Latin, that in the Latin original he most certainly read Plautus, Ovid and Senecca;' and as to "the Greek dramatists and all those Greek authors besides Plutarch, who appear to have influenced him,' that he had at least read them in Latin versions, and very probably was, with such help, able to read them in the originals. I think the literary world is indebted to Mr. Collins for these scholarly articles."

And again :—

"Should the advocates of the ignorant, uncultivated Shakespeare theory make a cheap retort as to the limits of my comprehension or of my classical knowledge I will not vex myself, for I need only refer them to Mr. Churton Collins' illuminating articles."

But there is another aspect of Mr. Greenwood's Problem which has not hitherto been mentioned here—"that Shakespeare, whoever he was, did not write a very large portion of the thirty-six dramas which were published as his in the Folio Edition of 1623 is now generally admitted. 'It may surprise some of my hearers,' said Dr. Garnett, in the course of a lecture to the London Shakespeare Society, 'to be told that so considerable a part of the work which passes under Shakespeare's name is not from his hand.' The first thing to do, therefore, is to make up

* *Ephemera Critica*, page 214.

† This essay, which comprises three articles which appeared in the *Saturday Review* by way of criticism on Judge Webb's "The Mystery of William Shakespeare," is notable for the fact that so powerful does the writer find the Judge's arguments that in combating them he is compelled to have recourse to "the suspension of natural laws."

our minds, so far as we can, as to how much of the Plays and Poems published under Shakespeare's name are, in reality, Shakespeare's work."

This is dealt with in chapters on Titus and the Trilogy; The First Folio; and The Early Authorship Argument. Mr. Greenwood is a staunch disciple of Malone. He will not accept *Titus Andronicus* or the "Trilogy of Henry VI." at any price, and here he is at issue with Mr. Churton Collins. He is also at issue with Mr. Edwin Reed on the Early Authorship Argument, and perhaps this chapter is the least convincing in the book.

But enough has been said to commend Mr. Greenwood's work to all students of Shakespeare. No Shakespeare library will be complete on the shelves of which it is not to be found. Its value is enhanced by a good index.

The Supernatural in Shakespeare.

By Helen Hinton Stewart. John Ousley, London. 159 pp. 2s.

A CHARMING little book, written by a member of the Bacon Society, dealing with the treatment by Shakespeare of the strong desire in the human heart "to peer beyond the boundaries of human existence, and to obtain a glimpse of that mysterious something which, although hidden from the senses, seems to vibrate in harmony with some secret chord within." The subject is divided into chapters on Presentiments, Ghosts, Fairies and Sprites, etc. It affords another testimony to the marvellous versatility of the mind from which the plays emanated. The authoress makes frequent reference to the writings of Bacon to assist in the elucidation of Shakespeare's metaphysical suggestions. The chapters on Fairies and Sprites, founded principally on *Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Tempest*, may be specially commended. The style is good and the theories are unostentatiously expressed. The book will amply repay perusal.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The Present State of the Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—There seems to be every indication that our controversy is nearly concluded. Hesitation about the Shakespearean authorship is being followed by scepticism. The critics are just a little more civil—not much, for their brief for the defendant still holds them pledged. They must be left to the next genera-

tion. Dr. Appleton Morgan writes to me these very hopeful terms: "It seems to me as if the Baconian occupation was gone. Nobody, except perhaps old Furnivall and your friend Churton Collins, and Simeon Lazarus Levi (Lee), who have copyrights, claims the Shakespearean authorship *au pied de la lettre. Restez tranquille, mon chere ami.* After thirty years of strenuous insistance that Elizabethan title-pages are barely *primâ facie* evidence of anything, I am glad to see that Mr. W. W. Greg has at last, by studying the watermarks, been able to establish my point *sans dire.* He is to be congratulated, and I hope that the prominence that the discovery will bring him will direct public attention to his paper in the *Library* of some years ago, in which he showed up the callow ignorance of Lee in editing the First Folio reprint."

Shakespearean advocates do not as a rule use any argument, they only make dogmatic assertions which help our case very much more than their wish to damage it succeeds in its purpose of injuring us. Dr. Anders challenged the Bacon people to produce ten coincidences between Bacon and Shakespeare not assignable to accident. The last issue of *Shakespeariana* supplies eleven such cases, of which scores of quite convincing echoes and parallels can be given; but Dr. Anders might claim accident as accounting for them. But the eleven coincidences given are not simply parallels, they are hard, concrete facts of definite historic import. Mr. Joseph Sohmers supplies them, and suggests that "If Dr. Anders pronounces these coincidences accidents, then he confronts himself with the greatest coincidence of all, to wit, that of eleven random accidents, every one of them points to a single and identical solution of a literary problem."

These coincidences will be found in another part of the present issue. Mr. Greenwood, M.P., I observe, announces another book on the Shakespeare problem which, without adopting the Baconian solution, fully accepts its negative side, and makes it his business to prove that the current notions about William Shakspere are untenable and some other author must be found.

And lately another pamphlet has been published for private circulation by Mrs. Septimus Harwood, M.A., of Sidney, entitled "Shakespearean Cult in Germany from the 16th Century to the Present Time." Mrs. Harwood has evidently studied the very valuable account of "Shakespeare in Germany," by Albert Cohn, in which the full text of the Ur-Hamlet is given; and her reading of it supplies the following very striking observations:—

Page 20. "One thing strikes me as very strange, to which Cohn does not even allude, and that is that these English actors in Germany seem never to have mentioned Shakespeare's name. Truly this is another Shakespearean mystery. To me it seems unthinkable that men, capable of appreciating in *any* degree Shakespeare's plays, learned *in* London in *his* very presence, and of performing them acceptably on foreign soil, had yet been so little struck with the personality of the *man* William Shake-

speare that among so many *bona fide* records of that time there is not *one* forthcoming to say that any one of them had ever spoken to him, or proclaimed his marvellous power to any of their German patrons and fellow-actors. Sometimes when reading Cohn's book one seems to get very near to Shakespeare; yet neither Pope nor Bryan nor Dowland tells a word about him, and the *man* Shakespeare escapes us here in the usual will-o'-the-wisp fashion that he does elsewhere. It is *almost* enough to make one think that, after all, the last nail in the Bacon-myth coffin has not yet been driven in, or, at least, to make one think that the Shakespeare whom these actors knew in the Lord Chamberlain's Company was a mere actor like themselves, and that they did *not* know the dramatist whose plays they performed; else how could they so completely have ignored him?"

Mrs. Harwood's harmless reference to the Bacon-myth is, of course, a sort of salaam to the literary police, who might put her under arrest and expose her to criminal prosecution if she ventured to join the ranks of the Baconian anarchists.

R. M. THEOBALD.

The Latest from the States.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

THE BACONIANA for April has an interesting article on a book by Hiram Corson, Professor of English Literature in Cornell University, New York State.

It is to be regretted that the writer of that article did not examine the book's copyright date, which is 1889 instead of the publisher's date, 1903. The book is so old and antiquated, not having been revised since 1889, that it is a sheer waste of time to pay any attention to it. No Shakesperite book of the last century is worth any serions criticism, for every such book is full of the forgeries of Cunningham, Collier, and other dishonest and unscrupulous Shagsperites.

To the article in the January BACONIANA, concerning early doubts of the Shakespeare authorship, I can add my commendation to that which is written concerning Col. Joseph C. Hart (1900-1856). I have read the part of the book that relates to the question of the Shakesperian authorship. The book is very rare. I found a copy in the Astor Library of New York City a few years ago. Mr. Hart did not at that time (1848), and in that book, make any claim for Bacon.

One day in 1844, at his house in Nashville, Tennessee, Mr. Return Jonathan Meigs was reading Bacon's "Instauratio" in the original Latin. He suddenly closed the book and exclaimed: "This man Bacon wrote the works of Shakespeare." Mr. Meig's son, then a lad of 14 years, who was sitting in the same room with his father, heard his father's remark, and has never forgotten it. In later years they frequently conversed on the subject of Bacon and his writings, and the son became a firm

believer in the statement that his father made on that day. This fact has been narrated to me more than once by the son, Mr. Return Jonathan Meigs, Junr., who is a clerk in the District Court of Washington, D.C. Emerson, Hawthorne, Whittier, Holmes and other American writers have expressed their doubts as to the ignorant peasant William Shaksper being the author of the Shake-speare plays, but there is no record that any of them came out boldly for Bacon, as Mr. Meigs did, as early as 1844.

Why do not the Baconians in England take up the records of the life of Shaksper, of Stratford, and prove the statements made in Major E. P. Burn's pamphlet of 1902, namely, that Shaksper must have been in Stratford every year after August 1596? Certainly the records of his law suits, land purchases, brewing malt, etc., etc., proves that he must have been in Stratford all those years. Halliwell-Phillips states that all documents call him "of Stratford," never "of London," and Halliwell-Phillips seems to be very much troubled about that evidence. He is also honest enough to state that there is no record that Shaksper ever purchased any property in London until 1613, which statement scatters to the winds all the statements about Shaksper's property in houses, theatres, etc., in London. If the same diligence is exercised in the case of Shaksper as has brought to light recently that Sir Thomas Bodley, as an officer of Queen Elizabeth's household, paid the expenses of Francis Bacon while the latter was in France (1576-79), surely something must be discovered that will soon put an end to the claims for the man of Stratford.

R. A. Smith.

War Department, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

An Italian News-Letter.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

Dear Editor,—Travelling may be profitably combined with research, as I have experienced lately. The Eternal City possesses in its Barberini Library in the Vatican a fair number of Bacon's" published works, but I can trace no MSS. of his, though MSS. are its especial feature, as Father Ehrle, its courteous and learned Prefect, told me. I find there no record of Montaigne's visit to Rome other than in his Diary. When I suggested that Francis Bacon at nineteen might have accompanied the Mayor of Bordeaux to the Vatican in 1580 I was answered, "Very likely; young men used to travel with older men as guide." Gregory XIII. (Buoncompagno) was on the Papal throne then, and his fine statue adorns the once Jesuit Library, now the Victor Emanuel State Library, in the *Collegia Romana*, which he founded. Profound research work in Italy is made well-nigh, if not wholly, impossible owing to the absence of Catalogues. MSS. have none. I was refused sight of the Subject Catalogue in the Victor Emanuel Library; the Librarian

alone sees it. That gentleman politely brought me two works not inscribed on the cards arranged alphabetically, which represent the only public catalogue. One of these was "The Life of Bacon," by Mallet, translated into French, and another by Georges Fonsegrive, Prof. de Philosophie à Paris, au Lycée Buffon [1893], in which the author says it was Bacon's constant "préoccupation" to "work for the *social* happiness of Humanity," a vastly suggestive remark; and that, according to Bacon, "Virtue to exist needs health and happiness."

It is said that the *Journal des Savans* [1666] testified to Bacon's worth. Can any Baconian supply the reference? Curiously enough I came across a piece of evidence in this Victor Emanual Library, Rome, which shows that Francis Bacon was as great an artist in the philosophy of dramatic expression as he was a past master in law. The *Daily Mail*, June 13th, found fault with Greenwood for ignoring this quality in Shakespeare. May I quote from *Histoire de la Vie et des Ouvrages de François Bacon* to emphasize it?

The author is Mallet, the date MDCCXLII. "Dans la conversation il pouvait prendre les charactères les plus différens, e parler le language qui convenait à chacun de ces charactères avec une facilité qui était parfaitement naturelle, ou du moins avec une dexterité qui cachait tout apparence d'art. L'orsqù'il parloit en public il savait non seulement captiver l'attention de ses auditeurs mais aussi les faire entrer dans les sentimens qù'il voulois leur inspirer. Comme ses paroles etoient alors accompagnées de toutes les graces de l'action . . . . il ne manquait jamais d'exciter dans l'ame de ses auditeurs les mouvemens qù'il se proposait d'y faire naitre. Je suis que l'echo d'un autre."

As a footnote gives Ben Jonson [Discoveries] as reference, we may fairly call this "an actor's criticism of an actor."

It should also be remembered that history records the fact that Sir Francis Bacon *dressed and staged* matinees for Greenwich Palace. Among the many works by Bacon, and on him, in this Library, the most interesting is "*Saggi Morali del Signore Francesco Bacono, Cavaliere Inglese, tradatti in Italiano in Londra*" [G. Billio, 1618]. It contains a dedicatory letter to *Don Cosimo di Medici Gran Duca di Toscane*, written, of couse, in Bacon's lifetime, by Tobie Mathew. It makes a very important statement, one that goes far to prove what I personally strongly believe—that Bacon in his youth visited Italy. I quote from the letter: "*Il vocabolo é moderno ma la cosa é antica . . . . le epistole di Seneca a Lucilio, non son altro che Saggi; cio é meditationi, o concetti . . . . in forme di lettere famigliari.*

Now follows the circumstantial evidence on which we may fairly build: "*V. A. S. mi dara perdone é a questa opera la sua protteltione; tanto più perche l'authore conserva, e honora la memoria di Gran Duchi Ferdinando e Cosimo di Medicis felicissimé progenitori di V. A. S. con affeto e anmiratione particolare.*"

To cherish the memory of a man "with affection and admiration" necessitates personal knowledge; at least, so it seems

to me. Ferdinand III. was a good and beloved Cardinal before he became Grand Duke in 1587 [b. 1551, d. 1609], and was ever an enlightened patron of art. He was, history tells us, secretly associated with England in commerce with Holland and Spanish America.* We know Elizabeth used young Francis in secret embassage, and that Montaigne visited Siena and Florence in 1580. It was then, I suggest, that Francis learnt to respect and love Cardinal Ferdinand di Medici, just ten years his senior —an agreeable picture of whom hangs in the Ex-Palazzo Reale of Siena to-day, a Palace not open to the public, but courteously shown to me the other day by special permission. Tobie Mathew's correspondent had a great commercial instinct too, and was a merciful, earnest young prince who brought great prosperity to Tuscany. He became Grand Duke at the age of nineteen, and in his pictures wears the Knight Templar's cross on a riband round his neck. Tobie tells him in this letter that he found the translation, both portions, in the possession of *Sigr. Guglielmo Candiscio, Cavaliere, Inglese, nobilissimo, di bellissimi parti, e molto mio Padrone, chi con il bene placito dell autore me le presto.*" This knight, of course, was no other than Sir William Cavendish, pronounced Candish—Bacon's faithful friend—and Ben of Hardwicke's son.

Who translated the "Saggi" into Italian is not said, but I find in the Jesuit *Casanatense Library* in Rome, in a Biographical Dictionary, the interesting fact that *Anna Bacone* translated twenty-five sermons by Bernardino Ochin from Italian into English. So there is no doubt whatever that her pupil, Francis, was already an accomplished Italian scholar in his early youth, and he probably did it himself. A fresh edition of the "Saggi," without this letter, came out in *Venice*, 1619, the next year, with the title: *Saggi Morali, opera nuova di Francesco Bacchon, corretta e data in luce dal S. Cavaliere Andrea Cioli, segretario Grand Duca di Toscania*. This first one, containing Tobie's letter, was only an English preliminary and private canter.

One other little bit of literary gossip and I am done. The Casanatense Biblioteca contains a Biography among "*Des Hommes Illustrés*" of Domine Redempt Baranzane [b. 1590], who founded the Barnabite Order in Montargis, 1620. He was an inventor, says Perè Niceron, his Biographer, at a time when to be one was a crime, and had relations with the *savans* of Europe. "I have in my hands," he goes on to say, "an original letter of François Bacon, Chancelier D'Angleterre, written to him a short while before his death. It is: 'Trop interessante et fait trop bien connoitre la manière de philosopher quils voulaient tous deux introduire pour ne la point communiquier au public.'" The letter, written in Latin, was signed by Bacon and dated London, June, 1622.

If Spedding has not included it among his letters, it would be easy enough to procure a copy. Baranzane was a famous

* ? Tobacco.

preacher near Geneva, where it is said he found scope for the controversies he carried on with zeal, and he died at thirty-three.

The Siena Library has no Catalogue of Subjects. Happily, before knowing myself guilty of a breach of etiquette, I handled the B.A.C. box of cards inscribed with the books of the library, *reserved for the use of the Librarian*, and saw many titles of Bacon's works, one an Elzevir, with a preface by Gruter, and an edition produced by a German, who says, "During Francis Bacon's peregrinations he wrote to me in the German Script," which is more than interesting. But I have already over-taxed your patience, and must reserve more chat for another time, and subscribe myself, Yours faithfully, ALICIA A. LEITH.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—The portrait in the 1623 Folio, and the address "To the Reader" opposite to it, were for me for many years a puzzle. In the lines :

> "O, could he but have drawn his wit
> As well in brass as he hath hit
> His face," etc.,

Ben Jonson seems to express a highly favourable judgment of the print as a portrait. Further, Martin Droeslout, by whom the portrait is signed, was, as we know from his other work, a most competent draughtsman. Yet the slightest examination of the portrait shows that it is about as bad a representation of a human face as it is possible to imagine ; it would disgrace the most inexperienced beginner in any art school. There appeared to be here a mystery that demanded solution.

The mystery was for me in part solved by a lecture by Sir Edwin Durning Lawrence that I heard last year, in which the lecturer showed clearly that the portrait is not a human face, but a mask, and that in place of the right arm and right side of the coat, the back of the left arm and the left half of the back of the coat are shown.

This led me to examine more carefully the lines referring to the portrait, and it then struck me that the word "hit" might be an old form of "hid." I referred to the Oxford Dictionary and there found under the word "hide" the following quotation :

> 1386 Chaucer Squires T. 504, "Right as a serpent hit hym under floures"
> "Till he may seen his tyme for to byte."

This seems to supply the complete solution of the mystery.

The scholarly Ben Jonson was no doubt well acquainted with Chaucer, and made use of this form, which was, we may safely assume, obsolete even in his day, to say that the true face of the author was hidden under a mask while appearing to express the exact opposite. If the word "hit" is read "hid" the lines become wholly intelligible in reference to the portrait.

A. à B. TERREL.

11, Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.

NOTES.

MR. JOHN MOODY EMERSON, of Wavertree, Liverpool, has discovered another anagram from the Sonnets. The last two lines of Sonnet 109 read :—

> " For nothing this wide universe I call,
> Save thou, my Rose, in it thou art my all."

These 61 letters, with much ingenuity, have been arranged to yield the following sentence: " I, Francis Verulam, this loving dualitie, to Henry Wriothesley, Southam-ton."

It is stated that " The first published copy of this anagram was most graciously accepted by His Most Excellent Majesty King Edward VII. on June 1st, 1908." It would be very interesting to know whether His Majesty was impressed by the anagram ; but it would be much more interesting to know whether the Shakespeare problem has received consideration from the king in the midst of all his multifarious State duties. The king is so level-headed and possesses such clear perception and sound judgment that a large number of his subjects would be very gratified to know that the facts which are the subject of the controversy had been seriously considered by him, and if so, with what result.

* * *

The *Lancet*, of the 13th of April last, had an interesting review of a pamphlet recently published by John W. Wainwright, M.D., New York, on *The Medical and Surgical Knowledge of William Shakespere*, with explanatory notes. The writer says: " The works of Shakespeare have been discussed from almost every conceivable standpoint, and many works have appeared dealing with his medical and surgical knowledge, notably one by Moyes, first published in 1896. A student, nay,

even a casual reader of Shakespeare, cannot fail to be struck with his numerous references to matters medical and surgical, displaying indeed a more or less intimate acquaintance with the medical lore of the times in which he lived. . . . All references relating to medicine are not given by Dr. Wainwright, but only those that have appeared to him to possess the most interest. The quotations are well chosen and the accompanying notes are, in general, useful."

* * *

There has been a correspondence in the *Westminster Gazette* as to whether the designation of "Lord Bacon" is correct. Mallet, Stephens, Montague, Spedding, and Hepworth Dixon, all use the term and it has come to be generally accepted. The following remarks, which appeared from the pen of Mr. Arthur Galton, appear correctly to sum up the position :—

"Bacon was Lord Keeper of the Great Seal before he was Lord Chancellor with a peerage. His proper title then was Lord Keeper Bacon ; or, popularly and improperly, 'Lord Bacon,' and this impropriety has been continued until it holds the field. It is none the less improper, though it certainly would be pedantic to speak of Bacon as Lord St. Albans. It would illustrate Matthew Arnold's phrase, 'Precise enough, but precisely wrong.' The great man should not continue to be 'Lord Bacon.' He should be Francis Bacon, or Bacon simply ; though he has not a monopoly of the name, and the other exceedingly great and interesting owner of it is too much forgotten in this age of science, of which he was so marvellous a prophet and precursor.

"The origin of the popular misuse is easily explained. We still have Lords of the Treasury, Lords of the Admiralty, Lords Justices of Appeal. The Litany makes a clear distinction between the Lords of the Council and 'all the Nobility.' Every Privy Council-

lor is technically a lord, though not necessarily a peer. His title of Right Honourable shows it. It would be unusual, though not perhaps incorrect, to speak of 'Lord Asquith,' 'Lord McKenna,' or 'Lord Vaughan Williams.' At any rate usage was much looser in the seventeenth century, and so the phrase 'Lord Bacon' was made current."

* * *

A Viennese Professor is reported to have delivered a lecture before the Society of Vienna Authors and Journalists, in which he took for his text the following extract from Lord Bacon's "Essay on Death": "It is as natural to die as to be born, and to a little infant perhaps the one is as painful as the other." The Professor maintained that death is almost invariably actually painless, that the *articulus mortis* is, except in quite exceptional circumstances, free from even the feeling of distress. The fear of death, common to all, is not a part of death itself, it is a physical scare of life. The actual and ultimate cause of death is undoubtedly in the large majority of cases the failure of the heart's action, and consciousness is generally lost before the heart ceases to beat. Even in gunshot injuries causing death, the fatal result occurs before the painful impression has had time to reach the brain from the skin. In drowning and all forms of suffocation the anæsthetic effect of the carbonic acid gas which has accumulated in the blood, exerts its full influence long before life terminates. In death from acute diseases, the toxins which accumulate in the blood so dull this mechanism of consciousness as to anticipate by, it may be, hours the bitterness of death. Thus, in a large majority of cases, that state of feeling described as the fear of death is itself not experienced.

* * *

In the April number of the *Library* is an article by

Mr. W. W. Greg on a volume in the library of Mr. Marsden Perry, at Providence Rhode Island, which contains ten Shakespearean and pseudo-Shakespeanean plays. The binding is seventeenth century and bears the name of a contemporary collector—Edward Gwynn. The plays are: *Merchant of Venice*, 1600 (Roberts' quarto); *Midsummer Night's Dream*, 1600 (Roberts' quarto); *Sir John Oldcastle*, 1600 (T. P. quarto); *King Lear*, 1608 (N. Butler quarto); *Henry V.*, 1608; *Yorkshire Tragedy*, 1619; *Merry Wives of Windsor*, 1619; two parts of the *Contention of York and Lancaster*, 1619; and *Pericles*, 1619. Mr. Greg has had access to copies of the same plays now in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, which were presented to it by Edward Capell. Although now in two volumes, they appear to have been originally bound together. In an article in the *Academy*, of 2nd June, 1906, Mr. Alfred Pollard propounded the theory that owing to the publication of two editions of *Midsummer Night's Dream*, the *Merchant of Venice*, and *Sir John Oldcastle* in 1600, and of *King Lear* in 1608, one edition in each case failed to sell out and in 1619 Thomas Pavier purchased the "remainders" and bound them up with unsold copies of his edition of *Henry V.*, printed in 1608, and other plays which he was then re-printing. After a careful scrutiny of the Capell Plays, Mr. Greg has advanced another theory, to which he has made a convert of Mr. Pollard. It is this—the ten quartos were not merely collected and published in one volume in 1619, but whatever may be the dates which appear on the title-pages, the whole set was actually printed by one printer at that one date. After an exhaustive examination of the type, the watermarks, a wood block used, and other features, Mr. Greg thus summarizes the arguments upon which he basis his conclusion. He says:—

"I claim that the dates 1600 and 1608 in Pavier's

collection are proved to be false dates, and the whole volume shown to have been produced at one time, namely, in 1619, by the following considerations:

"1. That certain large numerals appearing in the imprints are not elsewhere found before 1610.

"2. That the *Heb Dieu* device on two title-pages, dated 1600 (one purporting to be printed by Roberts), and two dated 1608, is not otherwise known between 1596 and 1610, and does not occur in any other book bearing Roberts' name.

"3. That the *Post Tenebras Lux* device found on one title-page, dated 1600, and purporting to be printed by Roberts, is not otherwise known between 1594 and 1605, and does not occur in any other book bearing Roberts' name, and, moreover, that the impression on the title-page, dated 1600, shows the block in a more damaged condition than other impressions dated 1605 and 1617.

"4. That the whole volume is printed on one mixed stock of paper, and that this could not have been the case if the individual plays had been printed at different dates extending over a period of twenty years."

In a subsequent article Mr. Greg proposes to treat of the false imprints of plays other than Shakespeare's. The foregoing conclusions afford some colour to the suggestion made in another column, in an article on "The Grave's Tiring Room," namely, that the date 1609 on the Sonnets is a blind and that they were not printed until after 1621.

* * *

A well-known public librarian recently sent to *The Daily Chronicle* some facts relating to an inquiry into the comparative popularity of the cheap reprints of standard English classics, and the results are somewhat startling, and certainly worth reproduction in the pages of BACONIANA. This librarian's tabulation shows that

Bacon's *Essays* is first in vogue as a book which it is proper for the "average citizen" to have on his bookshelf, as it appears in no fewer than *eighteen* series—the recent popular reprints. Shakespeare, Goldsmith, and Holmes come second only in the list with *fourteen* each.

* * *

There is in the "Boston College Stylus" of Boston, Mass., an article by Edward J. H. O'Brien, headed "Francis Bacon's 'Shakespeare.'" The writer concludes by inviting objections and criticisms and offering to answer them. He subjoins a list of books for consultation—all in the Boston Library and really accessible. Amongst these is BACONIANA (New Series, Vols. I.—X.; Third Series, Vols. I.—IV.).

* * *

The Society is indebted to Mrs. Payne, of Haywards Heath, for a very valuable gift of books to the library. It comprises seventy-four volumes, of which forty-six are modern and twenty-eight are ancient. Amongst the former is a copy of "Purchas, His Pilgrimes," twenty volumes; "Hakluyt's Voyages," twelve volumes; and a number of reprints. Amongst the latter are the 1630 edition of Michael Drayton's Poems, Fabian's Chronicles (1533). One volume is of special interest; it is the 2nd edition (1589) of the French Academy, by Peter de la Primaudaye, dedicated to the most Christian King Henry III., and translated into English by T. B. On the title-page of the volume is the signature "Cecill Canc: 1592" in Cecill's own handwriting.

Lectures, 1907-1908.

THE Society is indebted to Mrs. Chambers Bunten for having arranged an interesting series of lectures which have been delivered during the past winter and spring months. It commenced in November, when Mr. Fleming Fulcher read a paper

on "Shakespeare's French" at Miss Soutter's Studio, 133, Park Road, N.W. Mr. Granville Cuningham presided, and in the discussions which followed Miss A. Leith, Mr. Udney, Mr. Hawkins and others took part.

On February the 26th Mr. Parker Woodward read a paper on "Some Early Writing of Francis Bacon" at the house of Mr. Granville Cuningham, who presided. This was followed by an interesting discussion, in which Sir Edwin Laurence, Mrs. Pott, Mr. Harold Bayley and others spoke.

On May the 8th Mrs. Henry Pott secured the rooms of the Asiatic Society at 22, Albemarle Street, W., for the reading of her exhaustive paper on "Francis 'Bacon,' Lord St. Alban, the Concealed Man: An Attempt to trace Who he was, What he did, and How he did it—Traditional Marks and Symbols of his Secret Society," which was illustrated by lantern slides. The paper was read by Mr. Fleming Fulcher. The views included portraits of Francis Bacon and his dwellings, also reproductions of pages of rare books and paper-marks. Sir Edwin Durning-Laurence, Mr. W. T. Smedley, Col. Columb, Mr. A. T. Sinnett and Mr. A. à B. Terrol were amongst those who spoke.

The last lecture was delivered by Sir Edwin Durning-Laurence at his own residence at 13, Carlton House Terrace, on the 13th June, and was largely attended. The subject was "Shapespeare, Shotbolt, and Wagstaff." With the assistance of magic lantern views of sections of the title-page vignettes from Gustavus Silenus' book of Cryptograms and Ciphers, and other works of the period, Sir Edwin deeply interested his audience in various theories which he propounded as to Bacon's connection with works published under another name. The discussion which followed was conducted by Mrs. Gallup and Messrs. A. T. Sinnett, Udney, Crouch, Batchelor, Burgoyne and Smedley.

ERRATA.—In *Was Bacon ever abroad?* in April number, page 90, for "The Latin version of his 'Essay on Travel,' '*De Peregratione in Partos Extremos,*'" read "The Latin version of his 'Essay of Travel' '*De Peregrinatione in Partes Exteras.*'" Page 91, for "In the *Sylva Sylvanum*, Bacon says the same, in fact, perpetuates the same blunder as all the classic writers: Homer, Ovid, Virgil, Hyginus, etc., maintain that Proteus was *bound by a chain*, not *held by the sleeve*," read "In the *Sylva Sylvanum* Bacon says the same, in fact, perpetrates the same blunder: as all the classic writers, Homer, Ovid, Virgil, Hyginus, etc., maintain that Proteus was *bound by a chain*, not *held by the sleeve.*"